

Vol. I.

JANUARY, 1880.

No. 1.

THE
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY THE
Theological Faculty of Cumberland University.

FIRST SERIES, VOL. XVI.
SECOND SERIES, VOL. XI.

LEBANON, TENN.:
REV. J. D. KIRKPATRICK.

B.B.

BX 8901
C9

20 1900

CONTENTS.

I. A Chapter from the Evidences. By R. Beard, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Theological School, Lebanon, Tenn.....	1
II. Scientific Theism. By J. I. D. Hinds, Ph. D., Profes- sor of Natural Science, Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn.....	16
III. Sanctification. By S. T. Anderson, D.D., Professor of Mathematics, Trinity University, Tehuacana, Texas.	27
IV. Baptismal Regeneration—Part 1. By S. G. Burney, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Theological School, Lebanon, Tenn.....	42
V. Individual Immortality: The Problem of the Ages. By A. B. Miller, D.D., President of Waynesburg Col- lege, Waynesburg, Penn.....	76
VI. Exegetical. By R. V. Foster, Professor of Hebrew and New Testament Greek, Theological School, Lebanon, Tenn.....	91
VII. Editorial.....	95
VIII. Literary Notices.....	96



P.R.S.

THE QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1880.

ART. I.—*A Chapter from the Evidences.*

OF course I allude to the Evidences of the Written Revelation or to what we call the written revelation as it has come to us. Is it what we have been taught to consider it, a word from God, a communication from him to whom we look as our Heavenly Father; or is it the outgrowth of superstition, or of priestly trickery, with a view to an easy and unscrupulous domination over mankind? It may be supposed by some that an investigation into this great question is unnecessary; that such an inquiry is too late in the day. The writer does not think so. He thinks that such an inquiry is very apropos to the present times. If the tendency of what claims to be scientific inquiry at present, is to sweep away the foundations from under our feet—the foundations upon which some of us have thought ourselves standing for long years; upon which our fathers and our mothers before us have thought themselves standing amidst the buffetings of life, and in which they rejoiced when life's interests were fading before their eyes; it is certainly proper for us to look around, to reëxamine our ground. Are we in danger? Have we been misled? Have we built upon the sand? Is life a dream and death an eternal sleep? The writer of this article has been looking into these subjects for some time, first of all as a personal matter, and then as a matter of interest to those under his care. Perhaps some of the results of his thoughts may not be unacceptable to the readers of this Quarterly. As an experiment, this chapter is offered. All that I have to say on the subject, I propose to say quietly, thoughtfully, but earnestly. It is

6 VOL. I, NO. 1.—1.

not a theme for declamation or frothy elocution. I hope to bring to the fulfilment of my task frankness, candor, and fidelity to the truth. A Christian, or a Christian minister, has no more interest in being deceived in these subjects than other men. Let truth ever be our polar star.

I propose at present to confine myself to *one branch* of the argument for the *necessity* of a revelation, such as we have, or claim to have, in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures.

Dr. Paley, in his invaluable work on the *Evidences of Christianity*, says: "I deem it unnecessary to prove that mankind stood in need of a revelation, because I have met with no serious person who thinks that even under the Christian revelation we have too much light, or any degree of assurance which is superfluous. I desire, moreover," he says, "that in judging of Christianity, it may be remembered that the question lies between this religion and none; for if the Christian religion is not credible, no one with whom we have to do will support the pretensions of any other."

On the other hand, Mr. Horne has an extended argument in support of the necessity of a Divine revelation in order to a knowledge of many truths and many duties, of which it is important to us to have a knowledge—truths and duties of which we could not have a knowledge otherwise. We adopt the theory of the latter, proposing, however, to pursue our own line of thought. Whether this line is happily chosen is, of course, to be determined by others.

I. First, then, a primary inquiry with every serious man relates to his origin. In my inquiries, therefore, I begin with myself. How did I originate? There was a time when I was not. There was a time when my parents were not. I understand very well the relation which I bear to my parents, and the relation which they bore to their parents. I may follow the links of this chain as far as I please, or as far as I am able, but I do not find the first link. Left to myself, I could never find it. Yet there must have been a first link. There must have been a first man. How did he originate? Did he spring up spontaneously out of

the earth? But men do not spring up spontaneously now. Such a theory then does not satisfy me.

I take a parallel case. A majestic oak stands before me in the forest. How did it originate? Of course it is the offspring of an acorn. But how did the acorn originate? Of course it was the offspring of another oak. But how did that second oak originate? It must have sprung from a second acorn. I pursue my inquiries. When will I find the end? There must have been a first oak or a first acorn, but, left to myself, I never could determine whether the oak or the acorn was the first link in the chain, or how or when it originated. I might refer the matter to the botanist, or to the vegetable physiologist; he is a scientific gentleman. He can tell me a great deal about the properties of the oak and the acorn; but upon the subject under consideration, the origin of the oak or the acorn, he is as ignorant as myself. And this is only a specimen from ten thousand species embraced in the vegetable world. What do I know, or what can I know, of the origin of all these?

This is, however, a comparatively indifferent inquiry. It has no relation to my happiness, or to any obligation which I might possibly be under, arising out of my origin or my existence on earth. But the case is far different from that of myself. I cannot ignore the fact that I am a moral being; I am consciously so, and, if a moral being, I am not the offspring of an accident. I repeat, then, and press the inquiry, how did I originate? Was man originally self-existent? But men are not self-existent now. We have never heard of the phenomenon of a self-existent man. Such a development would startle a generation. We know very well that we ourselves are not self-existent, and we have just as much reason to believe that the first man, whoever he was, did not originate himself. How did he originate, who was he, and what was his name? These are earnest inquiries, and every serious man will make them for himself.

II. Shall I go to the Greeks and Romans for an answer? They possessed the keys of the knowledge of antiquity, and in all such inquiries they were substantially one. The

Sophists pretended to all knowledge. They professed to be able to answer any question which could be propounded to them. We have, however, no satisfaction from them on this subject. Ovid speaks of the "Opifex Rerum." How? After enlarging upon the origin of other things, he says:

"Sanctius his animal, mentisque, capacius altæ
Decrat adhuc, et quod dominari in cætera posset.
Natus homo est."

This is from Rome. It is evidently borrowed truth, clothed, however, in the language of poetry and fable.

The Greeks, although a cultivated people, and inclined to curious inquiries, are almost entirely silent on the origin of man. A passage in Democritus is as satisfactory as anything we have from them. Democritus was a Greek philosopher, and said to have been born about four hundred and sixty years before Christ. He devoted himself to the atomistic theory of philosophy. "Democritus taught that the motions of atoms were primordial and eternal. A rotary motion, which extended further and further, occasioned the formation of worlds. In this process, homogeneous particles or elements came together, not from the agency of 'love,' or 'an overruling mind,' but from natural necessity, in virtue of which things of like weight and shape must come to the same place, just as we observe in the winnowing of grain; the wheat and the chaff separate from each other, and unite in two masses instead of one." "Organized beings arose from the moist earth. The soul consists of smooth and round atoms, which are also atoms of fire. Such atoms are distributed through the whole body, but in particular organs they exercise particular functions. The brain is the seat of thought, the heart of anger, the liver of desire. When we draw in the breath we inhale soul-atoms from the air; in our expirations we exhale such atoms into the air, and life lasts as long as this double process is continued." "The origin of atoms, however, is not to be asked for, since," according to Democritus, "they are eternal, and therefore uncaused."* This is a specimen of what we

* Ueberweg. vol. I, pp. 69, 70.

receive from Greek sources. Such an account is not very satisfactory. Why do not atoms operate in such a manner now?

Take another specimen, from Epicurus. "The natural philosophy of Epicurus agrees substantially with that of Democritus. According to Epicurus, everything which takes place has its natural causes; the intervention of the gods being unnecessary for the explanation of phenomena. Yet it is not possible in every particular instance to designate with complete certainty the real natural cause. Nothing can come from the non-existing, and nothing which exists can pass into non-existence. Atoms and space exist from eternity. The former have a specific form, magnitude, and weight. In virtue of their gravity, the atoms were originally affected with a downward motion, all falling with equal rapidity. The first collisions of atoms with each other were due to an accidental deviation of single atoms from the vertical line of descent; thus some of them became permanently entangled and combined with each other, whilst others rebounded with an upward tendency, or side motion, whence ultimately the vortical motion, by which the worlds were formed. The earth, together with all the stars visible to us, form but one of an infinite number of existing worlds. The stars have not souls. Their real and apparent magnitudes are about the same. In the intermundane spaces dwell the gods. *Animals and men are the products of the earth; the rise of man to the higher stages of culture has been gradual.* Words were formed originally, not by an arbitrary, but by a natural process, in correspondence with our sensations and ideas. The soul is material, and composed of very fine atoms. It is nearly allied in nature to air and fire, and is dispersed through the whole body. The rational soul is situated in the breast. The corporeal envelop is a condition of the subsistence of the soul. The possibility of sensuous perception depends on the existence of material images coming from the surface of things. Opinion or belief is due to continued working of impressions on us. The will is excited, but not necessarily determined by ideas. Freedom of the soul

is contingency, that is, independence of causes, in self-determination."*

This long passage in relation to the philosophy, or rather the theology, of Epicurus, has been thus fully transferred that it might be distinctly before the mind of the reader. It is, of course, one form of materialism. Animals and men are productions of the earth, but how? Did they grow up spontaneously, or were the germs given, and were men and animals developed from them? We are not informed, evidently because there was no information to give. We want something distinct, but we do not receive it from this source. The foregoing are specimens of what we receive from Greece. They are not very satisfactory. Why do not atoms operate in such a manner now? And why have they never operated thus since the beginning, if they wrought thus then? And, furthermore, why does not the earth produce men and animals as at the first?

Sanchoniathan, a Phenician historian, begins mankind with two mortals, Protagonus and Eon, without pretending to give us any account of the origin of these. It would not, however, require a very fanciful speculation to identify them with Adam and Eve. But we could reach such a conclusion only by speculation.

Such answers as these we must receive to our inquiries into our origin; and renouncing or ignoring the Bible, we can find nothing better.

III. Shall we follow modern scientific guides? Let us consider.

1. Darwin gives the following account: "The most ancient progenitors in the kingdom of the vertebratæ at which we are able to obtain an obscure glance, apparently consisted of a group of marine animals resembling the larvæ of existing ascidians. These animals probably gave rise to a group of fishes as lowly organized as the lancelet; and from these the ganoids and other fishes, like the lepidosiren, must have been developed. From such a fish a very small advance would carry us on to the amphibious.

* Ueberweg.

We have seen that birds and reptiles were once intimately connected together; and that the Monotremata *now* in a slight degree, connect mammals with reptiles. But no one at present can say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes—namely, mammals, birds, and reptiles—were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes—namely, amphibians and fishes. In the class of mammals, the steps are not difficult to conceive which led from the ancient Monotremata to the ancient marsupials, and from these to the early progenitors of the placental mammals. We may thus ascend to the Lamuridæ; and the interval is not wide from them to the Simiadæ. The Simiadæ then branched off into two great stems, the New World and the Old World monkeys, and from the latter, at a remote period, man, the wonder and glory of the universe, proceeded.”*

This passage is supposed, as far as man is concerned, to contain briefly, perhaps, the theory of evolution as it is taught by the author to whom the writer refers. The substance of it is easily presented. Beginning with the lowest forms of life, in which there are neither organs of sense nor distinctions of sex, the living being ascends step by step through generations of fishes, including the eel kind, until it reaches the amphibious mode of life, and still onward until it reaches the monkey state, and then up to man, the wonder and glory of creation. This is one of the modes of satisfying my serious inquiry in relation to my origin. In this first generation of men and women, who have become such from monkeys, and primarily from *formless forms of life*, in the progress of hundreds of thousands of years, I am to find those from whom descended my father and mother. Christianity is sometimes charged with credulity, but certainly a credulity which can receive such a theory of the origin of the human race as that which is here presented, must excite our wonder in the comparison. If there is a single fact to illustrate and sustain the theory, it is beyond the reach of common minds; and yet by such fanci-

* Henry Hartshorn in Johnson's Universal Cyclopedia.

ful speculations it is proposed to supersede the sober and temperate account given by Moses. The truth is, if man was developed through such a process, no human being ever traced it out, and no human being ever will do it. It is not science; it can never rise above speculation, and the speculation itself must be pronounced a very light one.

IV. We have another mode of accounting for the existence of the first man and woman, or rather of the first men and women. Prof. Huxley presents the supposition that "at any given period in the past we should meet with a state of things more or less similar to the present, but less similar in proportion as we go back in time; that the physical form of the earth could be traced back in this way to a condition of things in which its parts were separated, as little more than a nebulous cloud making part of a whole, in which we find the sun and the moon and the other planetary bodies also revolved; and that if we trace back the animal world and the vegetable world, we should find preceding what now exists, animals and plants not identical with them, but like them, only increasing their differences as we go back in time, and at the same time becoming simpler and simpler, until finally we should arrive at that gelatinous mass which, so far as our present knowledge goes, is the *common foundation of all life*. The tendency of science is to justify the speculation that this gelatinous mass could also be traced further back, perhaps to the nebulous origin of matter.

"The hypothesis of evolution supposes that in all this vast progression there would be no breach of continuity, no point at which we could say 'this is a natural process' and 'this is not a natural process,' but that the whole might be strictly compared to that wonderful series of changes which may be seen going on every day under our eye, in virtue of which there arises out of that semi-fluid, homogeneous substance which we call an egg, the complicated organization of one of the higher animals."* This is another form of the theory of evolution.

* Lecture I. on Evolution. New York, 1876.

V. There are difficulties common to both these theories.

1. They are intended to exclude God from the universe which we think he has made. Still, they do not succeed; they do not exclude him; they never can succeed. Huxley's gelatinous substance, his protoplasm, which is the foundation of all life, according to his theory, as well as Darwin's marine larvæ, requires the intervention of a creator. How could the lowest forms of life have existed without some agent to give them even the form which they are supposed to have possessed? And especially how were they endowed with life without a life-giver? Life could not have been necessarily inherent in them any more than it is necessarily inherent in us. Huxley's gelatinous substance is matter. How did it originate? Matter is not self-existent. It was no more so in the beginning than it is now. It must have had a creator. An agent who can create, who can produce matter from nothing, can plainly do anything which requires power. The fact that what he has created possesses adaptability to a higher state of existence is an indication of intelligence. A being, then, who could have gone thus far in productiveness, could have created man at once. Why then should he have commenced on so low a plane, when he could just as well have commenced on a higher one? Creation is a miracle on whatever plane it may be wrought, or may have been wrought; it is governed by no laws. It admits of no necessary limitations. A power which can create, can produce a universe as easily as a fly.

2. They can never be tested by experiment or observation. Indeed, they are in conflict, as far as we can understand them, with all experience and observation. The gelatinous substance of an egg may produce a chicken or a duck, but has the chicken or the duck ever developed itself into a turkey or a goose? Such a thing has never happened within the memory of man. But according to the theory, much lower beginnings ought to have been evolving peafowls or eagles in every age of the world. In the process of evolution, according to Darwin, the monkey stands next to man, and Huxley, if we understand him, thinks a horse might, by splitting his hoofs and contracting his neck and

head, be very conveniently evolved into a man, yet neither a monkey nor a horse has ever become a man of history or tradition. Such a phenomenon would startle and exercise the curiosity of a whole generation.

3. There is another aspect of this subject. According to both these theories, we ought to witness now, and to have been witnessing for ages, spontaneous development and evolution on the part of man. Men ought to have become something greater than men. Why should the process have come to an end with our species? Darwin calls the man that sprung from the monkey, "the wonder and glory of the universe." But why should it have been so? Surely the mountain in labor has not brought forth much after all. We say nothing of the wonder, but the glory is small—it has been perverted. A few men scattered along the ages have been, and done, something; perhaps have shown themselves worthy of nature's effort, if we can say that nature can do anything; but the mass of men have been doomed to a lower plane in life—a plane, too, fruitful of affliction and sorrow. One of *our* men has said, and it seems to us very much like inspiration: "Man that is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble. He cometh forth as a flower, and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not." And another: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." These were biblical scientists. As things appear to us, they were very practical men. We ask again, then, Why did evolution stop with us? Why should it not have produced generations of heroes, philosophers, and sages? Why should it have spent itself even with our poor, frail humanity? Is this the best form which would have been possible to humanity? Certainly it has not reached that point. Yet we have no visible indications of an ascent in the scale of existence; no near approximations to what we would suppose angels clothed in flesh would be. On the contrary, we learn from all experience and observation that without the most favoring influences from sources above and beyond

himself, man's tendency is always downward rather than upward. His descent is easy; his ascent is difficult. According to both theories, however, the condition of things ought to have been just the reverse. Facts are not as pliant as theories. Where are the heroic Greeks of whom three hundred met and fatally disordered the hosts of Xerxes at Thermopylæ? Where are the matchless legions of Rome, who carried her conquering banners to the ends of the earth? They are in their graves; and who are their successors? Has there been an ascent or a descent in character? Has there been progress or regress in what constitutes the elements of physical, intellectual, and moral manhood? The question is easily answered. No improved generations of scholars, soldiers, or civilians have followed.

VI. We have still another aspect of this question to consider. It is certainly a law governing all animals; it prevails even among vegetables. We can improve a species in conformity with its nature up to a degree which would surprise us; but we cannot change its nature, and thus convert it into another species. We can cultivate a particular kind of fruit and improve it to an extent to which at first we could have had no conception, but we can never change it into another fruit. We may bestow as much labor as we please upon an oak, but we can never make it produce chestnuts. We may improve the fruit of the oak, but we will still have acorns. I may improve the race of my horses, but no possible improvement will change them, or what proceeds from them, into camels or elephants. We say, this is nature's law, to confine each species within its own limits. This law is fatal to the theory of evolution, as we have been considering it. The amphibia could never have become monkeys, nor could a monkey ever become a man. The caterpillar may become a beautiful butterfly; but if the butterfly wishes to reproduce itself, it must effect the reproduction through the caterpillar state. An attempt to violate the law would result in death. There is a distinct line drawn between every genus of animals and vegetables, and another distinct line between every species of every genus,

and those lines, so far as we know, have never been obliterated. I am aware of what may be said of hybrids, but they do not constitute exceptions to the rule.

In support of the principles here laid down, I call into requisition an authority from the department of theology—an authority that is working on the same line with ourselves. I am glad to avail myself of such assistance. “Mere development cannot account for origin of a strictly *new* thing. A germ can only protrude its own latency, and can never inlay a foreign one. The significant fact in natural history, not yet annihilated by the most torturing experiments of baffled theorists, that one species never expands into another, proves that though a process of development can be accounted for out of the latent potentiality at the base, the latter can only be accounted for by recurring to the creative power of God. The expansion of a vegetable seed, even if carried on through all the cycles upon cycles of the geological system, never transmutes it into the egg of animal life; and this only verifies the self-evident proposition that nothing can come forth that never has been put in.”*

It is a little remarkable that serious men can express themselves with so much confidence in regard to theories which, as I have said, have never been tested by experience or observation. For illustration of this remark, Mr. Huxley states in one of his New York lectures that his theory of evolution is as fully established as the Copernican theory, which is the present theory of astronomy. Now, the Copernican theory of astronomy is established and operates; that is, the parts operate upon the principles of mathematics and numbers. No evidence is so complete as these. Now, I ask the question in all sincerity, if my reader will allow that a man can be sincere in such a case; whether a man can be as fully satisfied of the truth of a theory, according to which man is developed originally from a gelatinous matter similar to what is contained in the shell of an egg, or from the larvæ of a class of molusks without head,

* Dr. Shedd's Introduction to History of Christian Doctrine.

without any regular form, without any of the senses, and without distinction of sex, as he can be of the truth of the Capernican system of astronomy, which can be tested, and has been tested again and again by the best scholars in the world, governed in their researches by mathematics and numbers? A man can hardly be serious in making such an argument as this. And yet these are called positive philosophies—philosophies which discard faith and profess to rest upon facts! What are the facts? Some of them, if they were facts, are millions of years old, as acknowledged by the theorists themselves. Who verified them, if they were ever verified? Of course they never were verified—they never can be verified. What sort of science is this? If it is not speculation *run mad*, I do not know what such a condition of things can be. Christianity is charged with credulity; was ever greater credulity displayed than in the reception of such theories as we have been considering?

These theories, and such as these, being in conflict with all experience and observation, and with what, as far as we know, is one of the established laws of production and reproduction in what we call nature, fall far short of satisfying my inquiries into my origin. They are mockeries of that which I seek so earnestly—of that which fills my heart.

VII. If, however, we turn aside from these empty speculations, as such as these, and go to the Old Testament, and especially to Moses, we find the question of our origin settled. After God had made all other things, he also made man. The following is the record: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone. I will make him a helpmeet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from

man made her a woman, and brought her to the man: and Adam said, This now is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man."

There are wonders in these accounts, but no absurdities, if we admit the existence of a creating power. And we insist that all theories must start from this point. They must set out with the existence of matter; and matter in its crudest state is no more self-existent than matter in its most perfectly formed state. The material of a watch is no more self-existent than the material of a stone. Huxley's *protoplasm* and Darwin's *lowest forms of life* are no more self-existent than Huxley and Darwin themselves. Protoplasm is a material; from whence did its elements come? Speak of it as you please, its elements did not make themselves. Who made them? I do not ask *what* made them, but *who* made them? The maker must have been a self-active *person*. I need not dwell upon this point here. It is out of the line of the argument. And again, Darwin's lowest forms of life are not only material, but *living* material. How could living beings exist without a *life-giver*? Matter is intrinsically dead. Without a great self-existent, self-active, intellectual, spiritual being, there never could have been either life or motion in the universe. All had been, even admitting the existence of matter, a silent and utter stagnation.

Admitting, then, as we have said, the existence of such a being as we have described—of course very imperfectly—we can settle the matter of the authority of the Mosaic account of the origin of other things, and among them, of the origin of man. If a man, however, in mathematics will insist that a part of a combination is equal to its whole, it is useless to labor with him until the defect is corrected. So, if in the midst of ten thousand effects, he will protest against the admission of a cause, or causes, adequate to the production of these effects, we can have about as much hope of him as of the other. Labor is lost in either case.

VIII. There is with myself an objection to the theory of evolution, which, as far as I have observed, has not been mentioned. It may be peculiar to myself. It is the amount

of time which would have been required to develop man, either from a living being of the *lowest form of life* or from a *protoplasm*. I do not know how others may consider the question, but the earth appears to me as being in its present organization, and with its present developments, not far above its *virgin state*; as comparatively a new world, redeemed from chaos, or in, perhaps, some other irregular condition. I could very readily believe that man has thus existed, as he now exists, six thousand years, which would correspond, according to our reckoning, with the Mosaic account; but if I am required by any theory to believe that under its present organization, it has required five hundred millions of years to develop a horse from an orhippus, and as much more time to develop the horse into a man, I hesitate. I must have more time to examine the evidence. I can a great deal more readily believe Moses than the evolutionist or the geologist, when he tells me that the world in its organization is, or must be, five hundred millions, or perhaps a billion, of years old.

I mean by its present form or organization, that form or organization in which it is now working out the fulfilment of its great mission. Christians believe that there is a God, and that by a great miracle he made and organized the world substantially as we now see it; and that in continuation of that miracle, he made man, and in further continuation of the miracle, he made woman; and that he gave the world into their hands, and subjected all other animals to their sway, just as we find them to be subject now, as far as man chooses to exercise that sway.

I take it upon myself to state, too, that both the evolutionist and the geologist must accept the same first principle which I have here *announced*, that "there is a God"—a God of wonder-working power—or he cannot take a first step in his reasoning. Say that there is no God, no great primary, self-existent cause, and you pronounce a theoretical annihilation upon every existing thing. I take myself, however, a different line of thought. That line leads me up to a great Creator, who made man and made woman, and benignly pronounced the two a unit, and in them I find my primitive

father and my primitive mother. God has made a gracious revelation to me, and to frail and helpless creatures like me, and this has disclosed to me one of the first truths to which my mind in its early years was directed—directed, however, hopelessly without this light.

R. BEARD.

ART. II.—*Scientific Theism.*

Das Wunder ist des Glaubens Lebstes kind.—*Goethe.*
Miracle is of faith the dearest child.

MIRACLE has ever been the foundation of faith and is a necessary condition of continued belief in God. By miracle I mean, what is more properly expressed by the German word "Wunder," wonder, prodigy, something strange, unnatural, not understood. If we could understand God, he would be no longer God. A religion not supported by *wonders* would find but few followers. The divinities of mythology were all invested with attributes supernatural and superhuman. If, to-day, mystery and miracle (Wunderwerk) could be eliminated from the universe, religion would find no resting place. God would be dethroned and we finite mortals would become gods, infinite, omniscient, and eternal. "You ask me what God is? If I knew it, I should be God; for no one knows God except God himself. Though we may in a certain way discover him in his works, like the sun through the clouds, yet we should not comprehend him better by that means. Let us say, however, that he is the greatest good, the first Being, the whole, just, compassionate, blessed, calm; the creator, preserver, moderator, omniscient, omnipotent; the father, king, lord, rewarder, ruler; the beginning, the end, the middle, eternal; the author, life-giver,

observer, artificer, providence, benefactor. He alone is all in all." These are the words of Vanini. What a description of God! Yet the man who wrote it was charged with atheism and condemned to have his tongue torn out and his body burned at the stake.

The idea of God is intuitive, a primary fact of knowledge. I know there are those who will object to this assertion, and I have not space here to give my reasons for the belief. The universality of the idea through all time will be admitted. Of the correctness of this intuition, miracle is the proof. Whether the miracle be genuine or imaginary, it equally convinces the mind. The history of religions is but a record of the deep longings and earnest strivings of the soul for a better knowledge of God.

Man in his early condition was entirely surrounded by miracles. He understood but few of the phenomena of nature, and hence looked upon them as manifestations of that divinity he was seeking. He incorporated the divine first with one and then with another of the objects of nature (Henotheism*), or divided the supreme essence among them all (Polytheism).

The common mind lost sight of spirit and made the object itself divine (Idolatry). As knowledge increased, natural processes became known and one phenomenon after another was explained. The divine gradually separated from the natural, and even at an early day, the existence of one supreme and only God, was clearly formed in the minds of the leaders of thought. While this was so, it was difficult to turn the masses away from their image-worship. Monotheism is then but the development of Henotheism, the integration of Polytheism, and still retains many ancestral traits of character. In illustration, we may mention the saint and Virgin worship of the Catholic church, and the three incarnations of Brahm. Brahm, in Hindü mythology is the name of that eternal, self-existent, omnipotent,

* For an explanation of what is meant by Henotheism, see "The Origin and Growth of Religion," by F. Max Müller. Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y. This is a most learned and original work and one of the most important publications of the past year.

omniscient Spirit, "who is the soul of all being and whom no being can comprehend." So terrible and awe-inspiring is this spirit that he cannot be approached by direct worship, but is accessible through three personifications, or incarnations of his attributes, and the mediation of a priest. These are Brahmā, the Creator; Vishnū, the Preserver, with his manifold incarnations, and Siva, the Destroyer and Regenerator. The Hindū religion is Monotheistic in essence, but Henotheistic and Polytheistic in practice.

The intuitive conception of Deity may be regarded as a divine revelation made directly to the individual. It is at best, however, crude and inadequate. To supplement this knowledge and better satisfy the human soul, God saw fit to give additional revelations through representative men, suited to the wants and stage of advancement of the various nations and peoples. Such may be regarded the teachings and philosophy of Confucius, Zoroaster, Mohammed, Plato, Socrates, etc. These were, however, simply propaedeutic. They were to prepare the way for the better revelation given through Moses and the prophets and completed in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. A great deal of this has already become a matter of history. The sacrifices of the patriarchs and the imposing ceremonies of the Jewish temple have given place to the more spiritual worship introduced by Christ. Formality and ritualism are passing away. God is coming nearer. Divine light, reflected from the face of nature and shining anew from the written word, irradiates the soul of man and he joys to look for still brighter apocalypses in the æons to come.

Man was not prepared fully to understand the divine communications, hence the anthropomorphic conceptions of Deity which have played so important a part in the history of the Church. It became the province and mission of science to help the mind to better ideas and to explain what was before incomprehensible. Each age built up an interpretation of its own. Science would expose its errors and thus enable religion to assume a position more in accordance with the true spirit of the word of God. Faith, however, is not progressive, and the heart relinquishes a cherished belief

with great reluctance. This accounts for the conflict which has existed between science and religion. The warfare has been between scientific fact and theological dogma. Between the teachings of nature and divine revelation, both properly understood, there can be no dissent. I venture the assertion that religion has come out purer and stronger from each contest; although it has been compelled to abandon what it deemed its most important fortresses. I can look forward to the time when it will have shaken off all its shackles, and science will stand by it as the demonstrator of its sublime truths and of its divine Author.

As the miracles of the past have been dissipated, new and unexpected ones have met us at every step. Some of the profoundest mysteries of nature are still as inexplicable as they were in the days of Job or Plato. Such are the mysteries of creation, life, thought, the essence of matter, the cause of force, etc. While modern research has been analyzing the process of nature with wonderful acumen, the nature-philosopher finds himself to-day standing in the midst of a vast plain whose boundary is the receding horizon, and where mysteries more astounding and incomprehensible meet him at every advance. With all his sweeping inductions and his proud philosophy, he is as much constrained to see in nature nature's God, as was the unlettered savage, or the shepherd on Chaldea's plain.

The doctrine of evolution, in its widest sense, comprehends all of modern science which can have any bearing upon theism and the Christian religion. Experimental science is simply a deduction of isolated facts and a classification of them into systems. It studies the *how*. When the question of why (First cause), and to what purpose (Teleology) arises, we pass to a field extra-physical (Psychology, or Metaphysics).

Evolution may be materialistic, or theistic. The fact of evolution is undisputed. It is written everywhere on the face of nature. The astronomer teaches it in the nebular hypothesis. The geologist finds it in the gradual development of the features of the earth and the forms of life. The biologist sees it in the development of individuals (Ontogeny) and races (Phylogeny). It is illustrated in Sociology,

the history of nations and the progress of knowledge, science, civilization, and religion. The fact being admitted, we naturally attempt to account for it. I desire now to mention some of the channels through which this explanation has been sought.

1. Chance has been suggested. Nature, human consciousness and reason anathematize the idea. Chance is but another name for unknown conditions. In the cast of a die, the motion and final position are as rigidly determined as is the motion of a planet in its orbit. In the latter case, the only conditions are the initial velocity, deflecting force of the primary, and the perturbations due to other planets. With our knowledge of the laws of attraction and motion, we can predict the position of the planet at any moment of time. The die is subject to the same laws, but the initial position, direction, and amount of force applied, and the resistances, are all unknown.

Again, what is called chance is often an unknown factor of a known product. The molecules of a gas are in constant motion, and the pressure upon the sides of the vessel containing it, is the resultant of the impact of its molecules. Impact is proportional to the product of the mass and the square of the velocity. We know the mass of the hydrogen molecule. It is easy thus to calculate the mean velocity of of all the molecules of any gas. But the velocity of each is different and constantly changing, and therefore indeterminate. Yet causality is just as necessary here as elsewhere.

2. Again, some have thought to explain the phenomena of nature by supposing that matter and force (*Kraft und Stoff*) comprehend all that there is in the universe; that they are eternal in the past and future, uncreated, indestructible, unvarying in quantity, subject to unchanging essential laws, and with inherent properties. This is substantially the theory of Dr. L. Büchner and may be called pure materialism. Its insufficiency may be seen from the following considerations:

(a) It excludes the Ego. Without the Ego we could have no consciousness; without consciousness, no knowledge. It is absurd to talk about matter's perceiving matter. The

material is cognizable only through the mind, and he has a serious problem to solve who would explain thought, volition, consciousness, and individuality with no other essence than the simple properties of matter.

(b) The theory excludes First and Final Cause, which have ever been regarded as data of reason and have been subjects of universal belief. That a thing can exist without a cause is unthinkable, and not only so, but a violation of reason and experience. The human mind is under as much necessity now to admit the idea of cause, as it was in the days of Aristotle. His classification of causes has scarcely been improved upon. He gives four kinds of causes, as follows:

I. Efficient Cause (*ὁθεν ἡ ἀρχὴς κινεσιως*). This is the origin of the thing, the reason why it is, the Ursprung. It may be (1) primary, the *causa causaram*, first cause, not dependent upon anything antecedent; or, (2) secondary, a cause which had another cause. Immediate and mediate is a distinction often made. It is the "Errs quod in se continet rationem cur alterum existat" (Wolf).

II. The Material Cause (*τὴν ὑλὴν καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον*)—German, Urstoff. This is the matter out of which a thing is made; or, that which is acted upon or originated by the efficient cause.

III. The Formal Cause (*τὴν οὐσίαν*, forma informans, the essence, *εἶδος*). This is the internal constitution, special properties, or attributes of bodies.

IV. The Final Cause (*τὸ οὖ ἐνεκα*). The object in view (*τέλος*).

These four causes are seen in the works of nature and art, and always argue intelligence. For example: Protoplasm is the material cause of a living being, the cell structure is the formal cause, while vitality is its efficient cause (secondary). The object of its existence is its final cause.

A simpler classification of causes may be based upon the assumption that matter is inert and that all force is will-force. This seems to admit of proof at the present day. Will is the only force within our knowledge that is adequate to the contravention of the general laws of matter. Vitality

is an unexplained phenomenon. All matter and force must then have emanated from a primary will, and their continued existence must be immediately dependent upon the same. This primary will has a creative and a directive (transeunt) power, both transcendental and extra-physical. The human will possesses only the latter and effects its purposes by using the forces which have emanated from the primary will. The results which have been attributed to secondary causes may be regarded as consequences of the directive power.

The attributes of Deity which are concerned in causality, are: (1) Intelligence to design, (2) will to determine, and (3) power to execute. We shall then have,

i. The Final Cause. This is the end in view, and of course must precede all action.

ii. The Volitional Cause, the determination to act.

iii. The Efficient Cause, the application of the power and the actual accomplishment of the object. The action may be (1) immediate, or (2) mediate. First Cause is the aggregate of the three.

The theory we are now considering is essentially that of the Atomists with the idea of First Cause left out. For although that postulated eternal atoms and eternal motions, Deity seemed necessary to account for their existence and workings, and was recognized by most of the advocates of the doctrine. The assumption of the eternity and self-existence of matter dispenses with the necessity of First Cause; and, while it can be nothing but an assumption—since it does not admit of proof—it is contrary to the consensus of mankind in general and the majority of philosophers. The idea is held by very few scientists, and the number is not increasing. Admitting, however, that matter and force are eternal, does not relieve us of the necessity of believing them created. The idea of their eternal creation is just as intelligible as that of the eternal conception of the Son of God. But I do not deem this admission necessary; for the objects of nature are finite, conditioned, and limited, and it seems to be a violation of good sense and reason to give them unlimited duration.

3. The next method of accounting for the present order of

things in the universe is embodied in "Spencer's Doctrine of Evolution." It may be briefly stated thus: All that we know of nature is manifested to us as matter, force, and motion. Back in the nebulous haze from which all things are supposed to have sprung, they had their birth; and through their agency has been evolved, by natural laws and without extraneous or supernatural interference, all that now appears. The systems of the heavens, the features of the earth; the succession of plants and animals through geological ages, man included; mind, thought, emotion, society, nations, all found their incipency and sufficient cause in those original elements. Further back than this lies the "Unknowable." The absolute origin of things is inconceivable, and hence they are eternal in the past and future. Evolution and dissolution are going on at the same time. If the former prevail, we have progress, otherwise we have retrogression. Evolution proceeds from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, the tension becoming greater. The heterogeneous is unstable. Finally a point will be reached when dissolution will begin and the heterogeneous will be resolved again into the homogeneous, only to commence a new evolution, and cycle after cycle will be completed, *ad infinitum*. This reminds us of the man who made the watch that was to run forever, by giving it two springs, one of which was to wind the other up while it ran down. Spencer recognizes an original power, but says that it is incomprehensible, inscrutable, not revealed in nature, and hence calls it "The Unknowable." This doctrine might be called semi-theistic.

(a) We may object as above that whether eternal or not, this matter, force, and motion must have had a creation, an extraneous will-force to originate it.

(b) A dissipation of force and motion is going on throughout the universe, and the tendency is to equilibrium. This is seen in the radiation of heat into space and consequent cooling of heavenly bodies, in the retardation of the planets in their orbits, in the rapid decomposition of organic bodies when deprived of vitality, and in the general disposition of substances to seek more stable chemical combinations. Yet,

in direct opposition to the uniformity of force and this tendency to equilibrium, we find heterogeneity on the increase, as is indicated by the general progress in the organic world and the evidences of evolution or improvement found everywhere in nature. This great and gradual increase of potential energy certainly indicates something more than the simple action of purely physical force.

(c) Spencer covers his "Unknowable" with such a mantle of darkness, and accounts for phenomena in so decidedly physical a way, that we can discern first cause but obscurely, and final cause scarcely at all.

4. A fourth hypothesis supposes a special internal force impressed at the beginning by the First Cause and acting afterwards *per se*. (Mivart).

5. The last theory that I will mention here is that of an immanent creative power pervading the whole universe, acting continuously and producing changes either gradual, or saltatory (Wallace). This conception recalls the monads of Leibnitz, but differs by clearly recognizing a superior and controlling transcendent power.

We may recapitulate as follows:

Hypotheses of the causes of the present order of things.

1. Chance. Excluded as irrational.
2. Matter and Force (Büchner). Materialistic.
3. A force which is a mode of the "Unknowable" (Spencer). Semi-theistic.
4. A special internal force impressed at the beginning (Mivart). Theistic.
5. Immanent creative power (Wallace). Theistic.

Of these theories, it will be seen that the first is irrational; the second is materialistic and atheistic; the third is semi-theistic and insufficient; the fourth and fifth are simply attempts to supply the deficiencies of the third. Spencer's doctrine fails to satisfy all the conditions of the problem, because it is too physical. He persistently refuses to give attributes to the "Unknowable." Approaching from the standpoint of mind and reason—and our knowledge of these is as real as our knowledge of matter—I think we are compelled to recognize intelligence, will, and design.

These attributes being given, we may legitimately investigate the methods of the "Unknowable." Questions arise such as these: Are matter and force eternal? If not, was the direct action of Deity confined to the original creative impulse, or is it continuous to the present day? The position indicated by the first question has been shown to be untenable. The affirmative answer to the second is found in Spencer's evolution, provided you throw over both Deity and the creative impulse the mantle of complete incognizance. Some grave difficulties meet us here. Evolution has not been regularly continuous, as we might infer that it would be, if it resulted simply in accordance with natural laws. It has been cyclical and saltatory. Its cyclical character is illustrated in the geological ages, the rise and fall of empires, the progression and retrogression of nations, and the birth, development, reproduction and death of organic beings. Its saltatory nature is seen in the introduction from time to time of certain factors, whose origin the doctrine of purely physical evolution is entirely incompetent to explain. Among these may be mentioned (1) the original creation (referred to the "Unknowable" in eternity); (2) the beginning of motion and material activity; (3) vegetative life; (4) animal life; (5) intelligence, common to man and animals; (6) reason, confined to man; (7) spirit, soul, *πνεῦμα*, also confined to man. The last includes conscience, moral nature, consciousness of immortality, religious ideas, etc.

The postulate of a Supreme Being originating matter, controlling its evolutions by will and intelligent design, and adding from time to time new creative impulses, satisfactorily and sufficiently explains away all these difficulties. This idea, too, is in exact accordance with our intuition of God, and the revelation he has given us. It in no wise conflicts with any of the facts or deductions of science. It bridges a hiatus which science has ever found itself utterly incapable of filling up. To my mind, it is a most remarkable fact that the elements of knowledge required for the explanation of the universe, beyond what we can get from nature, are the very ones which divine revelation has supplied. I see in this a prophecy that the science which

has been used against Christianity, is to become a convincing argument for its supernatural origin.

Without entering into further discussion, we may assume that matter is inert and entirely passive, that force is not an essential property of it, but something communicated to it from the primary will (will-force being the only force), that all the transformations of energy, all the forms of matter and all the evolutions, continuous, cyclical, and saltatory, are the results of immanent and presiding divine agencies. Yet is the divine existence entirely distinct. Nature is simply its handiwork. I quote a passage from Dr. Cocker's "Theistic Conception of the World" which is exactly to the point: "The theory which represents Deity as the transitive cause of the universe—a *δημιουργός*, mechanically fashioning the materials supplied to his hands, and then leaving it to the working of its own forces—is rank Deism. The hypothesis which regards the Deity as no more than the dynamical life of the universe—an informing and organizing soul associated with matter—is naked Hylozoism. The theory that reduces all existence, material and mental, to phenomenal manifestations of one eternal, self-existent substance, which evolves itself according to an inward law of necessity, and which is elusively called God, is Pantheism. But the doctrine which embraces the two conceptions of transcendence and immanence; and, while it teaches the immanence of God in matter, proclaims the infinite distinctness in essence between matter and God, and the infinite omnipresence of a personal God above and beyond the limitations of matter, is Christian Theism."

Let scientists pay a little more deference to the reluctance with which the world gives up long cherished beliefs, and let them not lose sight of the fact that there is a spiritual as well as a physical existence; and on the other hand, let theologians be more ready to receive and assimilate the results of scientific research, welcoming them as truths divine as the written word of God—let all this be done, and conflict will soon cease, religion and science will strike hands in covenant friendship, and a day of brighter knowledge will dawn upon our world.

J. I. D. HINDS.

ART. III.—*Sanctification.*

SANCTIFICATION is not only a doctrine of the Christian Church, but it is a very important doctrine. The Christian growth and development of a congregation depend largely on the proper presentation by the pastor of this important doctrine. If it be presented in a clear, scriptural light, good must result, and its members will be made morally and religiously stronger. But if it be presented in a false light, with human instead of divine shadings, evil will be the result, and its members will sink into a state of indifference, or they may become fanatical. Hence, the history of the Christian Church shows that the professed disciples of Christ have held to every phase of belief in respect to this doctrine, from him who declares there is no such thing as *sanctification*, to him who declares that he is as *pure as Jesus Christ himself*. These extremes are the results of false teaching. Hence the necessity that every Christian minister should correctly understand what the Scriptures teach on this subject, and that his own teachings on this subject do not deviate from what the Scriptures teach.

If sanctification be an important doctrine of the Christian Church, and if it be taught in the Scriptures, surely what God has revealed on this subject can be rightly understood, if we carefully and prayerfully study what is said about it in the Bible. An appeal to the Scriptures rightly interpreted, ought to settle all controversy on the subject; for the Bible is the only true, universal, and absolute standard of Christian faith. The Bible rightly interpreted is the infallible truth of God, teaching the true religion—Christianity in its purity. Its truths must and will permeate the heart of humanity, eliminating error till all men shall be pure in heart, and shall be governed by the truth—truth as revealed in God's holy word. Hence an appeal to the Scriptures ought to settle all controversy in respect to sanctification. Each passage of Scripture which speaks of sanctification

ought, in its proper connection, to be carefully studied, so as to arrive at the exact import of the word in its various forms and connections. Since the number of such passages is large, in this paper each one cannot be quoted and commented on; but the results of a critical study of them may be presented, and this is all that is proposed in this essay.

SANCTIFICATION is the act of making holy, and, as a Christian doctrine, it is that act of God's grace on the heart, by which the affections of men are alienated from sin and the world, are purified, and are exalted to a supreme love to God.

TO SANCTIFY is to make holy. While the idea of making holy is not lost sight of, yet usage has given several shadings to the verb. Hence, it means to *set apart to a religious use*; to *consecrate by appropriate rites*; to *hallow*; to *consecrate to the service of God*; to *make fit for the service of God*; to *cleanse from moral corruption*; to *make free from sin*; to *make fit for the society and employments of heaven*.

According to the scriptural usage of these words, either God or man is the agent.

I. When God is the agent.

1. *To sanctify* is to separate and appoint anything or person to a holy and religious use. Gen. II, 3: "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Ex. XIII, 2: The Lord said unto Moses, "Sanctify unto me all the first-born." Thus the tabernacle, the temple, the altars, the sacrifices, the utensils of the temple-service, and the priests were sanctified.

2. *To sanctify*, when God applies the word to himself, is to manifest his glory and vindicate his honor from the blasphemies of the wicked. Ez. XXXVI, 23: "I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes." The idea is, God would clear up and remove the objections that the sufferings and sins of the Jews had raised among the Babylonians. The Israelites had given the heathen occasion to think meanly and contemptibly of Jehovah, but it was

his purpose to show them that he is infinite in greatness and goodness; for their sufferings were brought upon them in departing from, and sinning against Jehovah; and thus both heathens and Jews would be taught the salutary lesson that God's holiness will not lightly pass over impurity in conduct or in worship. His mode of dealing with the refractory Israelites vindicated his character for holiness. A like usage of the word is found in Num. xx, 13: "This is the water of Meribah (strife), because the children of Israel strove with the Lord, and he was sanctified in them." The Lord was sanctified among them by demonstrating his omnipotence, veracity, and clemency, and by showing his impartial holiness and his severity against sin, even in his greatest favorites, as was Moses. In this manner God is said to sanctify himself. To sanctify is used in this sense when God applies the term to himself.

3. To *sanctify* is applied to the creatures—the things—which God has made for man's use, in order to free them from the curse which sin has brought upon them, and thus make them fit for a free and holy use. 1 Tim. iv, 4, 5: "Every creature of God is good, . . . if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

4. God *sanctifies* a sinner when he cleanses him from the pollution and filth of sin, when he frees him from the power and dominion of sin, and when he endues him with a principle of holiness. Hence, when God does these three things for a sinner, he is *sanctified*. This gracious work God by his Spirit does for all believers. With this idea before his mind, Paul thus addresses his brethren at Corinth: "And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."—1 Cor. vi, 11.

5. God the Father is said to have sanctified the Messiah when he separated, ordained, and appointed him to be the King and Head of his Church. John x, 36: "Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" The idea is as if Christ had said, "If the title of

gods be given to those to whom God has given some part of his dominion, then surely it does much more properly and truly belong to me, whom my Father has appointed to rule over all with himself, and whom he has separated and ordained for Mediator and King of his Church; which office cannot be assumed or executed by any mere creature, but by the eternal Son of God.

II. When man is the agent.

1. The term to *sanctify* is applied to man when he purifies himself, or ceremonially another, so as to be in a proper condition to appear before the Lord and to partake of holy things. Ex. xix, 10, 22: "The Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow; and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day." "And let the priests also, which come near unto the Lord, sanctify themselves." This preparation was made for the giving of the law by Jehovah on Mount Sinai.

2. To *sanctify* is used in the sense of *prepare*. In Num. xi, 18, is the command, "Sanctify yourselves against to-morrow, and ye shall eat flesh." So also in Josh. iii, 5: "Sanctify yourselves, for to-morrow the Lord will do wonders among you." The idea is as if God had said, Prepare yourselves, endeavor to bring your hearts to a holy frame, that with faith, reverence, and admiration, you may behold the great work which God will do for you.

3. Men are said to sanctify or hallow the name of God when they praise him, acknowledge his majesty, worship him, endeavor to make him known, adored, praised, and beloved by all who are capable of adoring, loving, and praising him. In Isa. viii, 13, Israel is commanded, "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." In Matt. vi, 9, in the Lord's prayer the verb is translated "hallowed"—"Hallowed be thy name." This is designed for all who profess to be disciples of Christ, or it would not be in the Lord's prayer. Hence, it is the duty of all disciples of Christ to pray believingly that God's name be sanctified, and that it be done by his being honored, praised, and glorified throughout the world,

and in a special sense by the righteous conduct of all Christians. Daily every Christian should ask himself, Am I hallowing the name of God by living a holy life, by my fidelity and submission to God's commands? Purity of heart is the great essential for which all Christians should labor and pray. But another idea involved is, that those who have a knowledge of God and do serve him, hallow his name by making him known to those who are ignorant of him; it is in a large measure the fulfilment of our Lord's last and sacred command, "Go teach all nations." Or we may say that what is meant by sanctifying the name of God, is more fully and clearly apprehended by considering its opposite. A man profanes the name of God by vain and profane swearing, by blaspheming, and by ascribing his name to idols; or by living as if atheism were true—in a state of moral and religious indifference. All holy living sanctifies his name; all wicked living and scandalous conversation profane his name.

God, in Lev. x, 3, says, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified." This was spoken when, by a sudden stroke, divine vengeance fell upon Nadab and Abihu and cut them off. By this act Jehovah showed what purity he required in his servants, and what punctual exactness he expected in his service, and thus his name was sanctified. All unbelief profanes the name of God. This is evident from what is recorded in Numbers xx, 12. The Lord chides Moses and Aaron, and declares they did not sanctify him before the people. Wherein did they fail to sanctify the name of God? He answers, "Because ye believed me not."

The terms *saint*, *holy*, and *holiness* are often used in the Scriptures in a sense quite cognate to that of *sanctify*. They are ascribed to God because he is the author of sanctity—holiness. Hence the cherubim and seraphim unceasingly cry unto him, *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts*. He is also called the *Holy One of Israel*. And the holiness of all creatures compared with his is as nothing. Truly Jehovah, the one eternal God, is holiness itself.

These few brief statements, in connection with a careful analysis of the scriptural usage of the words *sanctification* and *sanctify*, disclose the fact that their signification depends largely upon their connection and to what they are applied; and while this is true, scriptural usage justifies us in saying, *To sanctify* is used in the Bible in four senses, depending largely upon that to which it is applied.

First, to separate and set apart things or persons from a common to a holy use. For example, the tabernacle, the temple, the utensils used in the temple, and the priests.

Second, to employ a thing in holy and religious exercises, in the worship of God and in the celebration of his works. For example, the sanctification of the Sabbath.

Third, to confess that to be holy which in itself is holy, and to celebrate it as being holy. Thus it is to be understood whenever God is said to be sanctified. For example, when the pious pray, "Hallowed be thy name."

Fourth, to make persons holy who before were impure and unholy. This is its usage in those passages of Scripture which speak of the sanctification of the pious. For example, 1 Thess. v, 23: "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly;" that is, the Christians dwelling at Thessalonica.

As a doctrine of the Christian Church, special interest hinges on sanctification in this fourth usage of the term. Herein is found its practical application in the walk of him who professes to be a follower of Christ; and hence, in order that this walk be according to the Divine will, a proper understanding of the scriptural usage and import of sanctification is highly important.

Some divines have taught that sanctification is synchronous with regeneration, because when a person is born again, born from above, he consecrates himself to God and his service; and as a doctrine of the Church, they would confine it to this one point of time. Hence these teachers use the term sanctification, even considered as a Christian doctrine, in the first sense as given above. But surely our Lord did not use the word in this sense when he prayed for his disciples, saying, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth;" or the apostle Paul, when he prayed for

his fellow Christians, saying, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly." The regeneration of the persons here prayed for was considered as an event having already taken place, but the sanctification as a matter yet in the future. In regeneration there was a consecration, an alteration of the evil quality of the heart to good, a renovation of that nature by the Holy Spirit, so much so that if the individual were immediately to die after regeneration, as did the malefactor crucified with our Lord, he would be saved. Hence there must have been a sanctification; yet it does not follow that a fuller, more complete work will not be wrought in the soul of the believer after regeneration, and that what our Lord and Paul prayed for may not be realized.

That sanctification in the fourth sense, as named above, is a progressive work is more evident to the mind, provided the primary signification of the word is not lost sight of. It is the act of making holy, and as applied to man, is that act of God's grace by which his affections are purified, are drawn away from self, sin, and the world, and exalted to the supreme love of God. By the process of sanctification, believers are cleansed from moral corruption and pollution; are made fit for God's service and the society and employments of heaven. Hence it is evident that holiness is the ultimate end or object of sanctification. As truly as a Christian may grow in grace, so may he in sanctification. As truly as the former is a progressive work, so is the latter, as defined fourthly above, and as a doctrine of the Christian Church.

Dr. Whedon says, "To sanctify is to set apart to some special divine use; and this may or may not require an inner purification of the being set apart. If an unholy being, as man, be set apart to a pure use, he must be rendered internally as pure as the use to which he is appropriated. Of an indifferent thing, neither intrinsically holy or unholy, as a vessel for the sanctuary service, there can be no purification but a physical one with an emblematical meaning. Where a holy being, as Christ, is set apart for a holy work, as for the work of redemption, no inward purification is possible; for he is already perfectly pure." "The use to

which man is consecrated is eternal service in the sanctuary of heaven; but to attain this use his entire purification must be perfect. If he fails in this his failure is total." These remarks are correct, since whatever is set apart to God's service must be holy, in view of his holiness. Though the definition given of "to sanctify" is not literal, yet in view of its primary signification being borne in mind by Dr. Whedon, his statements embrace the truth. Observe, according to his view, man must be made as pure as the service to which he is set apart. Hence, since the ultimate end of that to which he is set apart, is the service of heaven, he must be made spotlessly pure. If he be not made thus pure, could he enter heaven? But in respect to the time when this degree of purity is attainable, men differ. The only true solution is to be found in the word of God, if it be the will of God that man should know.

The general sentiment of the orthodox Church is that sanctification in the heart of a Christian is progressive, and not an instantaneous work as is regeneration. As a progressive work, it consists in his becoming more and more like Christ, being Christ-like in his feelings and deportment, and being less and less attached to the world's forms and fashions. As the work progresses he gets the ascendancy over his evil thoughts, passions, and impure desires. His attachment to earthly objects is weakened, and in heart he is weaned from earthly emoluments, and becomes firmly attached to things which are unseen and eternal. His faith becomes stronger, and his reliance on the divine word becomes firm and immovable. As the world's hold upon his affections is weakened, his assurance of God's love is strengthened. The more deeply he drinks at the fountain of divine love, the more beauty and grace does he see in the gospel plan of salvation. In Christ he sees the perfect standard of purity, and the leading desire of his soul is to be more like Christ. Although he may be acquainted with some who are eminent for piety, and although he may greatly admire them for their devotion to God and His cause, and although he may greatly admire the saints whose names are recorded in the Scriptures and the history of the Church, yet he takes no one of these

as his model, or his standard for holiness. He takes Christ and him alone as his standard of excellence. He has a burning desire to be like his divine Lord.

The state of mind here described continues through life with many, and ought to be the experience of all. But a very large majority of those who profess to be Christians are governed by their feelings, which are a varying scale. The feelings rise and fall, being governed largely by the state of health and surrounding circumstances, hence their Christian experience is very variable. A steady growth in grace gives a steady advance in sanctification. This is evidently a duty; for such is man's natural constitution that he can not remain stationary, "Not to go forward is to go backward." A continuous effort to rise higher in the scale of morality is the duty of every one. Daily new supplies of grace are needed. The reason why this is true is because the regenerated still have something of the "old man" in them, more or less emotions to sin. This was Paul's experience. He says, "The law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin: for that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not: but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now, then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Sin was dwelling in Paul when he wrote his epistle to the Roman church; hence, he stood in need of sanctification, a progressive work of grace to be going on in his heart, so as to enable him to get the mastery over sin, so to put it under control as that he could live without the commission of any known sin. To arrive at such a degree of sanctification is the duty of all Christians. To do this requires daily a new consecration of self to God. It requires the man to walk by faith, to wait upon the Lord in prayer, and to yield his will lovingly to the will of God.

To accomplish the work of sanctification, the Holy Spirit uses divine truth. Our Lord prayed that his disciples should be sanctified through—or in—God's truth; and then he adds, "Thy word is truth." Truth is a representation of things as they really are; hence, our Lord prayed that his disciples might be made holy by entertaining just views of

themselves and of God. A right representation of man shows him to be exceedingly sinful and defiled in his soul. A truthful representation of God shows that he is pure and holy. The contemplation of these two truths leads every man who wishes to do right, to turn from sin, to seek after holiness.

A unity, which is perfect harmony, exists between the Father and Son. Christ prayed that this perfect harmony might exist among his disciples. Sin, by its action on the very fountain of man's being, has destroyed that divine harmony which ought continuously to reign supreme in his soul. Sin has left no room in the soul for that harmonizing spirit which would knit all hearts together. Complete redemption through Jesus Christ restores said spirit, and as the Father and Son are one, so all genuine believers become one, even as the Father and Son are one. But this cannot be, unless purity of heart and purpose dwell in the man. The work of sanctification must go on in the heart continuously, otherwise purity of heart and purpose are not attainable. When all Christians have become thus sanctified, they will then form one communion in holy love. Having arrived at this degree of sanctification, perfect unity will exist in the heart of each saint. But the only place, so far as man knows, where perfect unity exists, is around the throne of God. What Christ would have, is for each disciple to ascend the heavenly ladder—that ladder, whose foot rests upon the earth, but whose top reaches to heaven, even to the throne of God—step by step, till the word of truth makes him one with Jesus Christ. But in our efforts, in our thirst for the soul-satisfying water of life, we must not begin at the top, but must make sure of the first step; must see that we be born again, anew of God, through the agency of the divine spirit, by an application of the blood of Christ, which cleanseth from all sin, and by an application of the truth; for if we experimentally know the truth, the truth will make us free, and if the Son makes us free, we shall be free indeed. In the new birth unity with God is established, and spiritual life is imparted to the soul. This is the beginning of the work of sanctification, and as the Christian rises step

by step, sanctification progresses till finally he arrives at the top of the ladder, and he enters heaven singing hallelujahs to him who redeemed him.

Sanctification, viewed in this light, is not a one-sided influence brought to bear on the soul, making its possessor a sort of monomaniac, or something akin thereto, on the subject of religion. It does not cause him to separate himself from the great body of believers, as being more holy, or more righteous than they; but it makes him firm, constant, abiding, and always abounding in the work of the Lord. Holding to the truth of God, and the sound doctrines revealed by the Holy Spirit, he has correct views of God and his own relation to him: for sound doctrines give knowledge of God and sanctify the soul.

Too many seem to forget that the word of God is the great instrument in his hands for the sanctification of his people. In proportion as the work of sanctification progresses, a deeper regard for the word of God pervades the heart. Thus, by a more careful study of the Scriptures, clearer views of God's character and of what constitutes Christian duty are obtained. With such there is no vacillation, but a steady advance in Christian life, practising all those duties pertaining to Christian conduct. But those who do not use the word of God as the chief instrument in their sanctification are liable to run into extravagances, and many become fanatical in their professions of holiness. The only proper way to escape the evils which have been practised by so many in the past history of the Church, is to adhere closely to the word of God. The soul ought to abide in Christ by and through the truth of God's holy word, as applied by the divine Spirit. A strict adherence to Bible-truth makes a reliable Christian. A departure from the Scriptures, by depending on dreams and manifestations, will culminate in fanaticism. Thus many have fallen. Hence, let us adhere to the truth, remembering that God's word is truth—that truth which is divine, eternal, infallible, and holy. This can not be predicated of any word except God's: for all others come from fallible sources and are more or less mixed with error. Hence, God blesses no word but his own,

the truth which proceeds from himself. Hence, also, the doctrine that is not drawn from the truth of God, can never save souls. Therefore, "they who are true disciples of Christ live and move in the word of truth as their element; they *breathe* it. This element, like all means of grace, has a sanctifying tendency." It is by union with the incarnate Word that men become holy, separate from the world, united to God, and are made partakers of the divine nature. Hence, we may also assert that, "The living word of inspiration—that is, the revelation which the incarnate Logos made of God—is the divinely-appointed means of sanctification."

Some object to the view of sanctification here given as practically ignoring justification, and not differing from a growth in grace and the knowledge of our divine Lord. A little reflection and observation show that many of the commands of God, which take the form of doctrines in the Christian creed, overlap each other, and hence in their nature are quite similar. So it is with the commands just named. But a careful analysis shows them to be distinct, and therefore should be treated separately.

To *grow in grace* is to acquire that character that God can approve, and hence bestow upon the individual his spiritual favors in a special and enduring manner. The grace of God is favor bestowed upon man who, in view of his sin, has no claims on God for his blessing. Having forfeited all claims on God for his favor, if it be bestowed, it is because God graciously remembers the individual in view of what his Son has done for sinners, and not for what the sinner has done, or may do. Hence, as a person grows in grace, he acquires that character upon which God can look more and more favorably, and hence, can take him into more intimate fellowship with himself. Hence, growing in grace is increasing in favor with God, and has for its object an inward work whose fruit is the reception from God of greater blessings from time to time. It is not a stationary or passive work, but an active principle akin to the vital principle in a child, which from time to time gives an increase of body. So growth in grace gives a progressive increase of the divine favor. But on the other hand, sancti-

fication has for its object an increase in holiness, to be more like God.

To grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is so to study the Scriptures as to increase one's knowledge of the office and life-work of the Messiah, and to cultivate, through the prayer of faith, a more intimate knowledge of his spiritual presence to comfort and support his disciples amid their trials in a world of sin. By these means a more intimate acquaintance with Christ is established, and thus the redeemed soul is enabled to have communion with him.

Sanctification and justification differ in the following particulars:

1. Justification is the remission of the penalty due to the sinner for the violation of the divine law. Hence, in the act of justification God absolves the sinner from the guilt of sin and death. But sanctification is an alteration of the qualities of the soul from evil to good.

2. Justification pronounces the believer free from sin in view of the righteousness of Christ being imputed to him. Sanctification is the renovation by the Holy Spirit of the sinner's nature.

3. Justification is complete and perfect when God pardons the believing sinner and accepts him for Christ's sake. Sanctification is not complete and perfected when the sinner believes. Justification is perfect in this life, but sanctification is not.

4. Justification naturally precedes sanctification, and its work is perfected before sanctification can take place, for God sanctifies only those who are justified.

Hence, it is evident that sanctification in its ultimate end differs materially from justification, growth in grace, and growth in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But practically it walks hand in hand with the last named. In proportion as the injunction of the Apostle Peter is obeyed does the justified soul advance in holiness, his growth in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and his sanctification running parallel.

Religious enjoyment depends largely upon the degree of

sanctification to which the Christian has attained. In proportion as one walks in the newness of life, being led by the Divine Spirit, will be the degree of his consecration to Christ, and therefore his communion with God and the danger of his happiness resulting therefrom. Many seek for this consecration, and many do not, being content to live a life of nominal devotion to Christ and his cause. The man who daily studies God's word, applying its truths and promises to his own heart, and the burden of whose prayers is to be conformed to the image of Christ, will grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord, and the work of sanctification will progress in his soul, and in direct proportion to the strength of his faith. The further he advances the more deeply does he realize the truth of that declaration that *without faith it is impossible to please God*. Often, with such a person, the love of God is so fully poured into his heart, and presence of the Divine Spirit is so manifested, that he is borne away, as it were, on ecstatic wings, and his soul rests in peace, and he can truthfully say with David, "In thy presence is fullness of joy: at thy right hand are pleasures forevermore." In answer to his prayers, he experiences what Paul prayed might be the experience of the Ephesian Christians: "To know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God." Such a person realizes that he is rapidly advancing to that degree of sanctification and peace with God, which it is both the duty and privilege of all Christians to experience. "Till we all come in the unity of faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Not till there is a consecration of this character throughout the Church, can the millennial reign dawn on our sin-benighted world. Such consecration leads to active service in the cause of Christ, and it convinces men that there is a divine reality in the religion of Christians. Hence, letting their light shine as Christians ought to do, and men seeing their good works, are led to glorify God by true repentance and faith in Christ as a redeemer. Thus the example of a truly consecrated Christian, who is walking by faith, is a steady light, casting

its benign rays upon all who are in the sphere of his influence.

To sum up my views on the subject of sanctification and what I believe the Scriptures teach on this subject, let me bring it clearly before the mind of the reader by reference to a principle in the science of mathematics.

In Analytical Geometry it is demonstrated that the asymptote, though lying in the same plane as its curve, continually approaches the curve, yet can not touch it short of infinity. In the work of sanctification, *Christ* is the *curve* and the regenerated *soul* an *asymptote*. Sanctification is begun in regeneration, and as the person grows in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, he increases in holiness, and thereby approaches nearer to Christ, and thus he may go on making a nearer and nearer approach to Christ, not only in this life, but also in the world to come; but he can not attain unto the absolute holiness of the Son of God. His perfection is a relative perfection. And though his soul be cleansed from all sin by the blood of Christ and his heart be made pure, yet his purity falls far short of the purity of our Lord, and though his sanctification be strictly scriptural, yet his holiness can never absolutely be parallel to that of God.

S. T. ANDERSON.

ART. IV.—*Baptismal Regeneration.*

- I. The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rights and Ceremonies of the Church, according to usage of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 346 and 348 Broadway. 1857.
- II. Manual of Sacred History: A Guide to the Understanding of the Bible Plan of Salvation according to its Historical Development, by John Henry Kurtz, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Dorpat, etc. Translated from the sixth German Edition by C. F. Schaffer, D.D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 710 Arch street. 1877.
- III. Christian Baptist and Christianity Restored, by Alexander Campbell.

THE following quotation is taken from the first named work, and is part of the formulary used in the public baptism of infants—page 110: "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this child* is regenerated and grafted into Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits; and with one accord make our prayers unto him that *this child* may lead the rest of *his* life according to this beginning." This quotation gives us the animus of the book on the subject of baptismal regeneration.

The following quotations are from Kurtz—pp. 409, 410: "Baptism is 'the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost' (Tit. III, 5), connected, in this present life, with the water of baptism (John III, 5). We are received by it into the fellowship both of the death and life of Christ (Rom. VI, 3, 4), adopted as the children of God and made the heirs of eternal life (Rom. VIII, 17)." "Every baptized person is thus born again," etc. "When water is employed in baptism it is no longer regarded as merely a purifying element, but also and indeed, preëminently, as one that begets, fecundates, vivifies, and regenerates." "We cannot, therefore, be saved *without baptism*; but, on the other hand,

baptism without faith, not only confers no benefit, but also aggravates the individual's natural guilt."

We take the following from A. Campbell's *Christian Baptist*—pp. 416, 417: "I proceed to show that we have the most explicit proof that God forgives sins for the name's sake of his Son, or when the name of Jesus Christ is named upon us in immersion; that in and by the act of immersion, so soon as our bodies are put under water, at that very instant, our former or old sins are washed away; provided only that we are true believers. This was the view and expectation of every one who was immersed in the apostolic age; and it was a consciousness of having received this blessing that caused them to rejoice in the Lord, and like the eunuch, to 'go on their way rejoicing.' When Jesus commanded reformation and forgiveness of sins to be announced in his name to all nations, he commanded men to receive immersion to the confirmation of this promise. Thus we find that when the gospel was announced on Pentecost, and when Peter opened the kingdom to the Jews, he commanded them to be immersed for the remission of sins. This is quite sufficient, if we had not another word on the subject. I say, it is quite sufficient to show that the forgiveness of sins and immersion were in their first proclamation by the holy apostles, inseparably connected together. Peter, to whom was committed the keys, opened the kingdom of heaven in this manner; and made repentance or reformation and immersion equally necessary to forgiveness. . . . I am bold, therefore, to affirm that every one of them who, in the belief of what the apostles taught, was immersed, *did in the very instant in which he was put under water, receive the forgiveness of his sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit.* If so, then who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water?"

In his work styled "Christianity Restored," Mr. Campbell says: "A thousand analogies might be adduced to show that though a change of state often, nay, generally, results from a change of feelings, and this from a change of views, yet a change of state does not necessarily follow, and is something quite different from, and cannot be identified

with, a change of heart. So in religion, a man may change his views of Jesus, and his heart may also be changed towards him; *but unless a change of state ensues, he is still unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, anadopted, and lost to all Christian life and enjoyment.* For it has been proved that these terms represent states and not feelings, condition and not character, and that a change of views or of heart is not a change of state. To change a state is to pass into a new relation, and relation is not sentiment nor feeling. Some act, then, constitutional, by stipulation proposed, sensible and manifest, must be performed by one or both the parties, before such a change can be accomplished." "Again, whatever the act of faith may be, it necessarily becomes the line of discrimination between the two states before described. *On the one side, they are pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved. On the other, they are in a state of condemnation. This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, conversion.*"

These quotations are sufficiently lengthy to give the reader a clear conception of the general character of the doctrines taught by these writers concerning the design of baptism. They all teach baptismal regeneration, but do not teach it in the same sense. They agree as to the essentiality of baptism, but differ as to its exact relation to salvation. The Protestant Episcopal Church in England and in this country by no means denies the divinity, personality, and influence of the Holy Spirit, as do some others who advocate water regeneration. Their baptismal formulas, however, contain a strong infusion of Patristic theology, which teaches some sort of indefinable union or identification or consubstantiation between the Holy Spirit and the consecrated baptismal water, so that when the water is applied to the subject, adult or infant, regeneration actually intervenes, the water and the Spirit constituting but one agent. Hence the regeneration may properly be ascribed either to the water or to the Holy Ghost. This view of the subject crops out in the following quotations: "Dearly beloved . . . our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and

of the Holy Ghost; I (the minister) beseech you (the congregation) to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that, of his boundless mercy, he will grant to *this child* that which by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made a *living member* of the same."

—p. 307. Again: "Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, thy people, through the Red sea, figuring thereby thy holy baptism; and by the baptism of thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan didst sanctify water to the mystical washing of sin: we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon *this child*; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church."—*Ib.* Again: "We call upon thee (the Almighty) for *this infant* that he, coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of sin by spiritual regeneration; . . . that this infant may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing."—p. 308. Again: "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation."—p. 309. Again: "Ye (the congregation) have prayed the Lord Jesus Christ that he would receive him (*this child*), to release *him* from sin, to sanctify *him* with the Holy Ghost."—*Ib.* Again: "Seeing now . . . that this child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."—p. 310.

This is substantially Patristic baptism, and proceeds on the old assumption that all unbaptized persons are necessarily unregenerate, and of course lost; that unbaptized infants are excluded from the kingdom of heaven; that infant regeneration is possible; that regeneration is purely physical, and that the consent and active agency of the minister is necessary to regeneration. All such theories make the salvation of one person dependent on the will of another human being. It would perhaps be offensive to charge the advocates of the doctrine with superstition. We must, however, be permitted to say that it lacks a "*Thus*

saith the Lord," and is about as reasonable as the doctrine of transubstantiation or consubstantiation—is in fact a chip of the same block, and is one feature of Anglican Protestantism that needs to be protested against.

The quotations from Kurtz make it manifest that the German theory of baptism is no better than that of the English and American Protestant Episcopal Church. In fact, it is very much the same, bringing out, however, less prominently the Patristic element.

The quotations from *Christian Baptist* and from "Christianity Restored" present us with a different aspect of *baptismal regeneration*.

Mr. A. Campbell formally announces himself a staunch trinitarian, and makes the operations of the Holy Spirit indispensable to salvation. He, however, enshrines the Spirit in the written word, and denies the possibility of its operation independent of the word.

He says: "*As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas; so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas.*"—*Christianity Restored*, p. 351. Again: "We plead that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the divine record."—*Ib.* Again he says: "As all the influence which my spirit has exerted upon other spirits, at home or abroad, has been by stipulated signs of ideas, of spiritual operations, by my written or spoken words; so I believe that all the influence of God's good Spirit now felt in the way of conviction or consolation, in the four quarters of the globe, is by the word, written, read, and heard, which is called the living oracles."—*Millennial Harbinger*, vol. 6, p. 356.

These statements as to the operations of the Holy Spirit in conversion are very explicit, and show most conclusively that while Patristic baptism enshrines the regenerating power of the Spirit in the water, Mr. Campbell's theory enshrines the Holy Ghost in the written or spoken word.

In the former case the Divine Spirit, or God himself, cannot get to the human heart for regenerating or saving

purposes without water. In the latter case, he cannot get to the heart except through intelligible sounds audibly uttered, or through the medium of "*rags, oil, and lamp-black.*" According to one theory, a man out of the reach of water is beyond the dominion of regenerating power. According to the other, a man without the word is beyond the dominion of spiritual power; and in both cases, *no water, no salvation.*

Mr. Campbell, as the quotations show, makes regeneration consist in a change of state, as from an unpardoned to a pardoned, from an unjustified to a justified state. To this there is of course no objection. But he discriminates between a change of heart and a change of states, and allows that a man's views, feelings, and heart may all be changed in relation to Christ, and still be in an unpardoned state. This is a distinction without a difference. Every change of views is followed by a corresponding change of feeling, but every change of feeling is not regeneration, but is a change of state or condition in reference to the object concerning which the change occurs; *e. g.*, a feeling of enmity against God is a state of enmity against him, also a state of condemnation; and a feeling of love to God is properly a *state* of love to him; also a state of justification and peace. Mr. Campbell insists that this transition from one state to another cannot be made without some sensible act, and says; "*This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, conversion.*" This is as bad philosophy as it is theology, and logically leads to the conclusion that a man may believe right, and feel right, and act right, and yet be in a wrong mental state and finally lost; that is, the intelligence is right, the sensibilities right, the will right, and yet the man may be in a state of condemnation and may be lost. Absurdity! His elaborate distinction between a change of heart and a change of state is an illusive play upon words.

As the extracts show, Mr. Campbell teaches that baptism, regeneration, conversion, etc., are used to express the same act. The agent of regeneration is the baptiser. In this he differs widely from the English and German advocates of baptismal regeneration.

Leaving them to settle their differences among themselves as best they can, we propose now a brief examination of the question, Is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, in any form, authorized by the Holy Scriptures?

The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be (Rom. viii, 11). Out of this state of heart-corruption grows the necessity of man's reconciliation to God. This reconciliation implies remission of sin, conversion, regeneration or purification, justification, etc.

These terms are not synonyms, but they all express different aspects of the same subject and mutually imply each other, so that none or all are predicable of the same person.

This change of heart does not consist in a mere change of desire, nor in a mere change of purpose, nor of both, but is a renewal of the heart, so that it may be truly said that old things are passed away; behold all things are become (subjectively) new (2 Cor. v, 17); sinful things formerly loved are now hated, and good things formerly hated are now loved.

This change is the only solid basis of a true morality, the only subjective source of vital piety, the only ground of communion with God, and the only guaranty of eternal life.

Consequently a mistake in regard to this change is fatal to true morality, to vital godliness, to Christian enjoyment, and to the hopes of eternal life.

To this change water baptism is in some way related. This fact is clearly taught in such texts as Acts ii, 38; Mark xvi, 16; Acts xxii, 16.

But the question concerning which there is a difference of opinion is, "What is this relation?" It will aid us very much in our investigations of this subject, if we can ascertain the Jewish conception of what baptism is; of how it comes to be used as a religious institution or rite. Of course but little space can be devoted to this particular branch of the subject in this article. Let it suffice to state—

1. The word baptism, with its cognates, is Greek, and

Greek usage alone can determine the capabilities of the word.

2. This tribunal, from which there is no appeal, determines it to be an *immodal* word, which always demands *effect*, but is indifferent to the instrumentality and modality by which that effect is secured. Hence to undertake to define it by modal words, such as dip, dye, stain, whelm, plunge, bathe, pour, sprinkle, etc., as our lexicographers do, is as uncritical and erroneous as it would be to define our word *travel*, by the modal words *fly* or *crawl*, etc. Yet a baptism might be secured by the instrumentality expressed by any one of these words, as traveling might be effected by flying or crawling. But the immodal word and the modal word which may happen to become its servitor, are never the measure of each other. Travel does not mean to fly, but to pass from one place to another by any mode whatever. So with baptism: it calls for effect.

3. Hence it means *always* a change of state or condition, and whatever has the power to change the state or condition of a thing, has the power to baptize that thing. This is Classic, Judaic, Patristic, and Christian usage.

4. It is applied without discrimination and equal propriety to all classes of objects; as to countries, land, water, houses, cities, minerals, ships, animals, human bodies, and human souls, and the agencies by which the baptisms are effected may be as diverse as are the objects baptized; *e. g.*, a nation reduced to poverty by war is baptized, a seacoast overflowed by the tide is baptized, a besieged city reduced by famine is baptized, a ship lost at sea is baptized, a man drowned is baptized, a man drunk on wine is baptized, or stupefied by a drug or imbecilized by gluttony is baptized. Examples illustrating all these uses of the word, and a great many others of a similar kind, are given in Dr. Dale's most valuable work on baptism, to which those who may wish to study the subject are referred.

Such was the current Classical usage of the word baptism, when the Greek became the common language of the Jewish people after the conquests of Alexander the Great, from 250 to 300 years before Christ.

Jewish usage from this time on conformed strictly to the Classical usage in the use of this word, as may be seen by consulting any original copy of Josephus or Philo, or other Jewish writers and Patrists. The immediate successors followed suit, using the word, however, mainly as expressive of spiritual and miraculous changes.

When the Hebrew language ceased to live on the lips of the Jews, they were under the necessity of selecting a nomenclature or a set of appropriate words to represent the facts, the rites, forms, ceremonies, sacrifices, oblations, purifications, consecrations, dedications, etc., of the Mosaic ritual or temple service.

In doing this, they selected to express these Mosaic purifications, consecrations, etc., the words purification (*καθαρισμος*) and baptism (*βαπτισμα*) and their cognates,

The Jews, in reference to secular matters, used these words in strict accord with Classical usage, but in appropriating them to sacred uses, imported into them ideas that they had never before been used to express. In doing this they do not transcend the capacity of the words, for, as we have seen, baptism possessed a capacity giving it adaptability to any sort of change possible in the realms of matter or of mind. The word did not express to the Jew a new idea, for the idea for which he wanted a word had been fixed and fossilized in the Jewish mind for twelve hundred years. The word, then, had nothing whatever to do with settling the idea, but the idea selects the word, and so far changes it from its secular usage as to make it the vehicle of its own expression. The word, however, still retains its Grecian costume; its fundamental signification is a change of state or condition, and its flexibility or capacity to express different kinds of changes, both ideal and real, moral and ritualistic, but is withal thoroughly Judæistic as to its sacred uses, designs, and modes.

As this is a subject not well understood by many that want light, and as this version of the matter is not in harmony with certain favorite baptismal theories, it will not be improper to refer to authority for the assertion that baptism was understood by the Jews and early Christians to be expressive of a part of the temple or tabernacle service.

Preliminary to this, it is proper to state that Christ himself used the word in a sense strictly in accord with Classic and Judæic usage in reference to himself: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened (oppressed) till it be accomplished!" (Luke XII, 50; Matt. xx, 22; Mark x, 38.)

Paul also uses the word in the same general sense (change) in 1 Cor. x, 2: And were all baptized unto Moses in (by) the cloud and in (by) the sea. The translation is unfortunate, for the Hebrews were not in the cloud nor in the sea (water). These baptisms were both without water and by invisible agents—different in nature and in results, but both expressing the fundamental idea of a change of state—one from life to death, the other from distrust and hatred to faith and love for Moses. They relate, however, to no sacred ordinance, Jewish or Christian, but give us clearly to understand Christ's and Paul's idea of what constitutes a baptism.

But in Heb. ix, 10, we have an unmistakable reference to the tabernacle service by the use of the word baptism. The writer, in speaking of this service, says of its ritualistic requirements: "*Which stood* only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (baptisms, βαπτισμοίς) and carnal ordinances," etc.

Now, these meat offerings and drink offerings and carnal ordinances are readily and unmistakably found in the ritual used in the tabernacle service, and right along with them divers specifications for purifying and consecrating the priests, purifying from the dead bodies, cleansing from leprosy, etc. The water of purification is mentioned with special emphasis both in the law (Num. xix) and also in Heb. ix, 13, in close connection with these divers baptisms. Now, if these purifications are not what Heb. ix, 10, calls baptisms, then the law must have been mutilated since Paul's day, for they certainly can be found nowhere else in connection with the tabernacle service. But if a shadow of a doubt remains, it must be removed by the testimony of those Greek and Roman writers who were the contemporaries and successors of the apostles. If these men did not know what constituted a baptism, then it may be assumed that no man ever did know.

Josephus' Jewish Antiquities, iv, 4, expressly calls this purification by sprinkling with ashes a baptism. Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, also so describes it. Sirach also calls it baptism. These Jews understood themselves, and their testimony cannot be controverted.

The Patrists also speak of many events recorded in the Old Testament as baptisms. From their decisions as to the use of the word in their own language there is no appeal. The word baptism of course does not occur in the Old Testament; but if the events there recorded—such as the sprinkling of the ashes of an heifer, etc.—are called baptisms by Josephus, Philo, Sirach, and the Patrists, and above all, by the inspired writer of Hebrews, who dare controvert their statements?

Paul's "divers baptisms" having been identified with the tabernacle purifications, it is now pertinent to inquire in what sense did these Mosaic baptisms purify or take away uncleanness?

1. Did they take away physical defilement? The answer is, By no means; but, as is apparent, the application of the baptizing material—as blood, oil, ashes in solution, etc.—would physically defile instead of cleanse the person to be purified. This fact is distinctly recognized by the law of purification, and hence, after the application of the baptizing material was made, the party was required to wash for the purpose of physical cleansing. Hence the baptism was no physical cleansing.

2. Did they purify the soul or purge the soul from dead works to serve the living God? Answer, No; the intuitions of reason ought to be able to see the impossibility of any such purgation by any such agency, for it is not within the functions of matter to act upon mind, as we will, at another place, more fully show.

There is, however, a more sure word of prophecy, to whose tribunal we will refer this question for final settlement. "Which (the tabernacle) was a figure for the time then present, in which was offered both gifts and sacrifice that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience."—Heb. ix, 9. This shows most con-

clusively that the whole tabernacle service, when used in its completeness, could not cleanse the conscience or take away the guilt of sin.

Again, Paul says that this purging of the conscience was the function of the blood of Christ. Verse 14: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" This teaches clearly enough that conscience-purging, soul-saving, was the exclusive function of the blood of Christ.

3. The only remaining question possible in reference to the cleansing power of these baptisms is, Did they ceremonially cleanse or sanctify, to the purifying of the flesh? The answer is an emphatic affirmative. No other answer can be given, for we have a "Thus saith the Lord" for it, that on the one hand they could not cleanse the conscience, and that on the other, they really produced physical defilement, and hence of sheer necessity, if they purified at all, it was only in a ceremonial or typical sense. This only *could they do*, and this only *did they do*, Paul being judge. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the sprinkling of the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh," etc.—Heb. ix, 13.

Both questions, second and third, are also fully sustained by Heb. vii, 11; viii, 19. It is, in fact, the grand design of this book to show the impossibility of salvation by ritualism, and to be the consequent of some agency more efficacious than external acts of worship.

We have now very briefly but not inaccurately, as we think, traced baptism as a *Jewish* institution up to its origin, and find it to be an *old thing* with a *new name*—as old as the Mosaic ritual, and which for twelve hundred years before Christ wore a Hebrew costume, but which some two hundred or three hundred years before Christ doffed its old dress and donned Greek attire.

We have also seen what it was not intended to do—to cleanse from physical defilement; also what it could not and did not do—purge the conscience from dead work or cleanse the soul from sin; also what it was appointed to do: what

it could and did do—sanctify “to the purifying of the flesh,” or make ceremonially clean. This power it had not inherently, but by Divine enactment, and every enlightened Jew so understood it.

The question now is, Has baptism any more power as a Christian ordinance than it had as a Mosaic ordinance, being in both cases equally of Divine authority? Why should it at one time have power only to cleanse from ceremonial pollution, and at another time have power to purge the conscience and save from sin and death? Who can assign a satisfactory reason? Perhaps the only reason any man of discernment would venture to give is, substantially, that God himself has given to Christian baptism power to purge the conscience, and that for this reason it is of greater efficiency than Mosaic baptisms. To all such reasons we here only reply, that it is in the highest degree improbable, as will be subsequently more fully seen, that God should make any physical act the condition of moral purification or of regeneration.

But we inquire, Where is the proof that God has done this thing? Unless the proof, full and explicit, can be given that God has changed in toto the functions of baptism, as a sacred institution, the evidence is clear as noonday, that it has no power as a cause, condition, or instrumentality to produce moral changes.

II. Jewish Baptisms.

As previously stated, the Jews became familiar with the Greek language two hundred years or more before Christ, and their writings show that they were quite familiar with the capabilities of the word baptism. They accordingly adopted a suitable verbal symbol for their private religious and daily purifications. But they adopted it in a sense strictly analogous, both as to mode and design, to that in which the Mosaic baptisms were used.

A few facts taken from the New Testament will satisfy, it is presumed, the most credulous on this subject.

1. Mark VII, 4, 8: “And *when they come* from the market, except they wash (baptize, in Greek) they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to

hold, as the washing (baptism) of pots, and cups, and brazen vessels, and of tables" (couches or beds). The first part of this verse seems to be a reference to an abbreviated form for purification from pollution contracted by contact with any dead body, as given in the law of baptism. This shows conclusively that they considered this Mosaic purification a baptism, but not a *moral purification*, but a purely ideal and symbolical one. The second part of the verse shows that they predicated the possibility of ceremonial uncleanness of their furniture, pots, cups, beds or settees, etc. The baptism was not for physical purification, but for religious purposes. Of course they did not mean to change the moral condition of these insensible things—they had no consciences to purge or sins to be forgiven. But they did mean to make them ceremonially holy. [These texts are suggestive as to the Jews' conception of the mode as well as of the design of baptism.]

2. Luke xi, 37, 38: "And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him, and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it he marveled that he had not first washed (baptized) before dinner."

Now, it is simply incredible that the Pharisee expected Jesus to regenerate himself before seating himself at the table and as preparatory to taking his dinner. Well, what did he expect Jesus to baptize himself for? Certainly only for the purpose of ceremonial purification. Nothing else. The reader can take another hint—a pretty strong one, too—as to the mode as well as the design. [Why our translators suppressed the word baptize and substituted wash in these three instances and in Heb. ix, 10, must be left to conjecture. It is simply inexcusable.]

But it may be said that these baptisms were only Jewish superstitions, and have no bearing on the subject of baptismal regeneration. Truly they were, at least in part, superstitions, but they have great bearing on the subject in hand; because they show most clearly what the Jews' conceptions were as to the capabilities, designs, and mode of baptism. They did not conceive it possible for baptism to procure a moral and spiritual change, such as regeneration. This

Nicodemus most positively shows in his interview with Jesus (John III). They did, however, believe it possible for baptism to procure ceremonial purification. The evidence is complete.

3. This view finds further proof in a comparison of John III, 25, 26: "Then there arose a question between *some* of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying (*καθαρισμῶν*), and they came unto John and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same baptizeth and all *men* come to him."

(a) What these Jews, some of them John's disciples, call (in verse 25) *purifying*, they (in verse 26) call *baptizing*, thus making the two things identical in mode and also in character.

(b) They are presumed to have understood whatever difference there may have been between the design of John's baptism and of that administered by Christ's disciples (John IV, 1, 2), but they make no discrimination between them as to mode or as to whether they were procurative of *moral* or only of *ceremonial* and *symbolical* changes. They evidently regarded them as purifications—one no more and no less than the other; and we must allow that they understood themselves, and they are, therefore, in this matter safe guides for us. If John's baptism, therefore, was not procurative of a moral change, as we shall presently see, it then follows that Christ's baptism was not, at least as administered before his crucifixion.

If it is objected that this was not the true Christian baptism, and therefore has nothing to do with the issue before us, we reply that it matters but little whether it is the true Christian baptism or not; it shows clearly enough that the baptism administered by Christ and his disciples before his crucifixion was only ceremonial or ideal and not real moral purification.

4. The next baptism in chronological order is that of John. He "preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."—Mark I, 4. It is sufficient for our present purpose to inquire whether this baptism was in order to the remission of sins, or only declarative of repentance

and remission of sins. The answer to this question is at hand: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance."—Matt. III, 7.

John here makes repentance a condition precedent to his baptism; hence baptism was not in order to repentance or remission, but only declarative of them. If John's own explanation fails to satisfy any one on this point, the testimony of Josephus may relieve his doubts. He says: "For Herod slew him (John the Baptist), who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so come to baptism, for that the washing (with water) would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away (or the remission) of some sins (only), but for the purification of the body, supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness."—*Jewish Antiquities*, B. XVIII, ch. 5, sec. 2.

The quotation is self-luminous and needs no comment.

The baptism of Jesus (Matt. III, 13–17) is a fair exemplification of the power of John's baptism. He of course was not baptized with any reference to repentance or remission, being without sin, but "to fulfil all righteousness," or, as Dr. Clarke purposely renders, "*to fulfil every righteous ordinance*," for there is no way to fulfil all righteousness but by compliance with all righteous requirements of law. As a non-official, he had submitted to circumcision, kept the passover, and observed all the requirements of the law.

Now, in entering upon his priestly office, it became him to observe the law of induction into this office. [See law, Ex. xxxix and Lev. viii.] This is so obviously the reason of his baptism that nothing but the *exigencies of a theory* would be likely to suggest any other. But on any explanation, his baptism was purely ceremonial, and not procurative of a moral or spiritual change, and thus exemplifies the character of John's baptism.

5. In connection with John's baptism, and closely allied to it, is the baptism administered by Christ and his disciples, mentioned in John iv, 1, 2; III, 22, 25, 26.

Of this baptism we know nothing, except that it was administered by the disciples under the supervision of Christ, and that only for a short period—three years or so—if it is not in fact the present water baptism of Christendom.

It is generally very confidently asserted that this baptism was not the present water baptism of the Church. This position seems to us to be *assumed* rather than proved—at any rate we have never seen any facts or reasoning that seemed conclusive. It has been suggested that if this is Christian baptism, then Christ baptized in his own name; or rather his disciples did for him. This takes for granted that Christ had a verbal formula, and that his *own name* must be included in this formula. Here are two assumptions without proof.

As far as we know, a verbal formula was not necessary to a ritual baptism. But if Christ had a formula and used his own name it would not be materially different from his procedure in the institution of the Lord's Supper.

But it is insisted that Christ instituted Christian baptism in the great commission (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20). We readily grant that he there gives us a definite formula; possibly a new one: possibly it is only an old one, so modified as to make it appropriate to all nations. But a new form of words does not necessarily imply a new ordinance. The great commission is given in different forms, by different evangelists. It seems to us more reasonable to allow the baptism in hand to be the true water baptism of the Church.

1. Because, with the lights before us, we can see no place intermediate between John's baptism and Christian baptism. The former related to repentance; the latter to conversion or regeneration. John was the herald; Christ the party heralded; repentance is the psychological herald, the prelude and pledge of regeneration. What intermediate state of mind can exist between repentance and regeneration which can be intelligently symbolized by this supposed intermediate baptism? Answer who can.

2. If this supposed intermediate baptism was not substantially the Christian, then it seems quite sure that the anti-Pentecostian disciples, including even the apostles,

never received Christian baptism at all; for while Luke is particular to inform us that John's disciples (Acts xix, 5) were rebaptized, he says not a word about the rebaptism of any of Christ's disciples. This distinction between the baptism administered by the disciples before and that administered after the crucifixion, is probably made more in the interest of polemics than of exegesis.

Settle the question as we may, it is evident enough that this baptism did not secure remission.

(a) Because the Jews, who thoroughly understood the question, identified this baptism, as to its mode and nature, with *purifying*, which, as has been seen, they used in a ceremonial and not in a spiritual sense.

(b) Because they identified it with John's baptism, as to mode and nature, or power; and it has been shown from the testimony of John and Josephus, that John's baptism was not procurative of remission.

(c) Christ himself refused to commit himself or to receive many that professed to believe on him, because he knew their hearts (John ii, 23-25). Now if his baptism had been to procure remission, it is quite certain, as he came "to save the lost," that he would have baptized and thus saved them.

(d) Those that received John's baptism were accounted his disciples, and those that received Christ's baptism were accounted his disciples; but many of these deserted him, for though they were discipled, had faith enough to be baptized, yet had not faith enough to purify their hearts. (See John vi, 60-66.) Even Judas, we suppose, should be included in this number.

We have now briefly considered all the "divers (water) baptisms" mentioned in the New Testament, unless it is true that Christ instituted a new baptism, that in current use, after his crucifixion.

We have also seen that they were not designed to effect moral or spiritual changes, either by those that instituted them, or those that administered them; nor were they expected to do so by those that received them; nor in fact could they do so, as will be fully shown, without a miracle, and that too, such a miracle as God never

wrought, viz.: the production of a spiritual change by material agency.

Hence, it follows that if water baptism is spiritual regeneration, or procurative of it, then baptism is a standing miracle, or a miracle repeated in every effective baptism—a miracle, too, which may be evoked at any time, and at the will of the baptizer.

The fallacy of this whole theory of water regeneration may be proved by many lines of argument quite independent of each other in their logical processes, yet all leading with a sort of cast-iron stubbornness to the same conclusion.

The first of these to which allusion is made, is that the needful renovation of man's moral and spiritual nature is ascribed to a very different baptismal agency, viz.: to God or the Holy Ghost, or spirit baptism, of which water baptism is the appropriate and Divinely-appointed type or symbol. These two baptisms, that of water, and that of spirit, the type and the antitype, are, by the sacred writers often put in the same or similar verbal relationship to the same event, yet, from necessity, sustain different logical relationship to such events. (For verification, see Isa. XLIV, 3; Ez. XXXVI, 25; Matt. III, 11, 16, 17; John III, 5; Acts I, 5; II, 38; VIII, 12, 15, 16, 38, 39; IX, 17, 18; X, 44, 48; XIX, 5, 6; Eph. V, 26; Tit. III, 5; 1 Peter III, 21.)

In these texts the two baptisms are associated. Both denote a change of state; but not the same state. One is a physical substance (water), applied by a physical act (human muscle controlled by human will) to a physical subject (human body). This is type baptism. The other is a spiritual essence (grace and truth) applied by a spiritual agent (God or the Holy Ghost) to a spiritual subject (the human soul). This is antitype baptism.

The former secures outer and ideal purification, and visible connection with the visible Church. The other is inward, real, invisible, and secures induction into the invisible and only true Church, the body of Christ.

These baptisms are not dependent one upon the other—are not necessarily synchronal or co-incident. One may exist without the other, as numerous texts clearly show.

In many texts, water baptism alone is mentioned; and in many others, spirit baptism alone is mentioned; or which is the same thing, the word *baptism* is used metonymically—the type put for the antitype. On this account they are often incautiously confounded, or one mistaken for the other. This confusion is the principal source of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and from it the doctrine receives well nigh all its plausibility.

The tygal and the antitygal baptism may be readily distinguished from each other in various ways, as by the context, by the verbal combinations employed, by the possibility, or impossibility, of interpreting the terms of the text in a strictly literal way, as expressive of a physical process.

But there is one test which, if I have not deceived myself, is absolutely infallible. [We have no recollection of having ever seen the point stated by any writer; hence, as far as we know, we venture upon untrodden ground.]

The rule is this, water baptism is always into the NAME of the person or substance in, or into, which it introduces its subject. But spirit baptism is never in, or into, *the name* of the person or thing, but always in, or into, *the person or thing itself*. Verification:

Water Baptism—1. Matt. xxviii, 19: "Baptizing them in the *name* of the Father."

2. Acts ii, 38: "Be baptized every one of you in the *name* of Jesus Christ."

3. "Only they were baptized in the *name* of the Lord Jesus."—Acts viii, 16.

4. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the *name* of the Lord."—Acts x, 48.

5. Acts xix, 5: "When they heard *this* they were baptized in the *name* of the Lord Jesus."

6. 1 Cor. i, 13: "Were ye baptized in the *name* of Paul?"

7. 1 Cor. i, 15: "Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine *own name*."

That these baptisms were all by water no man ever doubted; but mark it, they were all *in* or *into* the *name*. In fact, the great apostolic commission required all water

baptism to be administered in the *name* of the Trinity, "baptizing them in the *name* of the Father," etc. The texts cited above are the only instances in which this form occurs in the New Testament.

Spirit Baptism—1. Rom. vi, 3: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized *into Jesus Christ*," etc.

2. Rom. vi, 3: "Were baptized *into his death*."

3. Rom. vi, 4: "Therefore we are buried by baptism *into death*."

4. 1 Cor. x, 2: "And were all baptized unto (into, *εἰς*) Moses in the cloud, and in the sea," or properly, by the cloud and by the sea.

5. 1 Cor. xii, 13; "For by one Spirit are we all *baptized into the body*."

6. Gal. iii, 27: "For as many of you as have been *baptized into Christ* have put on Christ."

These are the only instances of this form in the New Testament, and we do not hesitate to affirm that in not one of these texts is water baptism referred to, or intended; but, on the contrary, they all refer to spirit baptism; or if we prefer the expression, that baptism is in all these texts used in a metonymical sense, the type put for the antitype. It may occur to the reader that the rule does not hold good in regard to Moses and Paul, (1 Cor. i, 13, 14, and x, 2) "baptized in (into, *εἰς*) the name of Paul," and were all baptized into, (*εἰς*) *Moses*. But upon a little reflection it will become very clear that this case, so far from breaking the rule, does much to confirm it.

1. If the Corinthians had been baptized in or into the name of Paul, their baptism would not have changed their hearts, faith, or feelings, in regard to him; but would have been only a public and formal declaration of Pauline discipleship; just as water baptism is in fact a public and formal declaration of Christian discipleship. But the baptism of the Hebrews, *not into the name*, but into Moses himself, was a very different affair. They were not by that event made the disciples of Moses, for they were as really so before it as after it, but they were radically changed in heart—in their faith and feelings in regard to him. When

the Hebrews saw themselves hemmed, as in a triangle, the sea forming one side, the mountains another, and the Egyptian hosts the third, they were in despair and chided Moses for bringing them out of Egypt. They had lost all faith in him, and their hearts were full of bitterness towards him. But when God, through the instrumentality of this distrusted man, brought glorious deliverance, they were wild with transports of joy, greatly magnified the Lord and Moses, his chosen servant. Their baptism into him consisted in their changed state of mind in regard to him. (See Ex. xiv, xv.) The sea and the cloud were factors in this baptism. The sea, by the division of its waters, contributed to it. The cloud also, by turning its bright side to the Hebrews and its dark side to the Egyptians and pouring a flood of light over the former and of darkness over the latter, contributed to the same result; so they are truthfully said to have been baptized (not *in*, for they were neither in the water nor in the cloud, but) by the cloud and by the sea.

2. If the Corinthians had been baptized into the *name* of Paul, it would have been *with water*; but the Hebrews were baptized into Moses *without water*—a dry-shod baptism, as the history shows.

3. If the Corinthians had been baptized into the *name* of Paul, the baptism would have been administered by some man; but in the Red Sea baptism, God—who is a spirit—the Holy Spirit, was the administrator.

4. If the Corinthians had been baptized into the *name* of Paul, the baptism would have been only a nominal baptism; a baptism only in name; or *real* only as to the *name*, but unreal as to any identification of life and spirit. So in all water baptisms, they effect no radical spiritual changes, and give no vital connection with Christ.

These statements show quite satisfactorily that the baptisms in relation to Moses and Paul, so far from disproving our *text rule*, do most consistently and beautifully exemplify and establish it.

In further confirmation of the facts that water baptism puts its subjects into nominal relation to Christ, while spirit

baptism puts the subject into vital and saving fellowship with him, may be shown, beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt, by a careful examination of three distinctly marked classes of texts; the first class comprising those texts in which water and the spirit, the type and the antitype, are verbally associated; the second class, including such texts as present only the *type*, and the third, those that present only the *antitype*.

To the first belong the following:

(a) Eze. xxxvi, 25, 27: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." Here we have the water, the Spirit, the new heart, and the cheerful obedience.

(b) Mark i, 8: "I, indeed, have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Matt. iii, 11; Luke iii, 16; John i, 26.)

(c) Matt. iii, 16: Jesus is baptized with *water* and with the *Spirit* of God.

(d) John iii, 5: "Except a man be born of the *water* and of the *spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

(e) Acts i, 5: "John truly baptized with *water*, but ye shall be baptized with the *Holy Ghost*, not many days hence."

(f) Acts ii, 38: Here we have repentance, baptism, and the Holy Ghost.

(g) Acts viii, 12, 15, 16: The Samaritans believe, are baptized, and receive the Holy Ghost.

(h) Acts viii, 38, 39: The Eunuch believes, is baptized, and the Spirit, who caught away Philip, evidently filled the Eunuch's heart, who goes on his way rejoicing.

(i) Acts ix, 17, 18: Saul is filled with the Holy Ghost and is baptized.

(j) Acts x, 44, 48: Cornelius is filled with the Holy Ghost and is then baptized.

(k) Acts XIX, 5, 6: John's twelve disciples, found at Ephesus, were baptized and received the Holy Ghost.

(l) Tit. III, 5: Here we have "the washing of regeneration and the *renewal* of the Holy Ghost."

These examples abundantly show that water and the Holy Spirit, in relation to salvation, are not co-ordinate agents, but are related only as symbol and substance, having no fixed order of antecedence, and no dependence one upon the other. All the texts cited above, and all others that in any way connect water with regeneration, may be easily explained on this hypothesis.

The correctness of this position will further appear from the following facts:

1. No two agencies, or instrumentalities, one spiritual and the other physical, can sustain the same relation to the same event. In the texts cited above, remission, regeneration, etc., are related in some sense to two agencies, water and spirit, but cannot be equally dependent on both agencies, acting either singly or conjointly. If not sadly mistaken, this proposition when applied to any event, whether physical or moral, will stand the test of the severest criticism. Let us put into this crucible, John III, 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Regeneration here is not procreation, as Mr. Campbell's theory seems to imply, insisting, as he does, that the regenerated soul is begotten of the Spirit and born of water—hence a double parentage. In refutation of this idea, it is sufficient to remember that "begotten," and "born," are in the original the same word and may be indifferently used, except when the volitive element is required to be brought out, as in 1 John v, 2.

Nor is regeneration the creation of any new faculty, but the renovation of the heart; or, as Paul (Rom. XII, 2) calls it, "*transformed by the renewing of your mind*," and (Tit. III, 5) "*renewing of the Holy Ghost*." All the facts utterly exclude the possibility of a double agency, one importative, and the other receptive; for it is not the water that is acted upon, as the theory of the Patrists, as also that of Mr. Campbell seems to imply, but the soul itself. Hence, in the New Testament

use of the word, to be *begotten* is to be *born*, and conversely.

Now it is so self-evident that it hardly needs to be stated that a man cannot be the child of two fathers, or of two mothers, in the same sense; and no more possible is it for a man to be born of water and of the Spirit, in the same sense.

But then a man may have two fathers, in two radically different senses—one according to the flesh, and the other by adoption, or some such artificial mode. He will be of the blood and lineage of the natural father, and will sustain some external and artificial relation to the adopted father. Of the latter, only the unreal and artificial child.

So a man may be born of the Spirit and of the water in two radically different senses, one real and spiritual, in which is imparted to the soul the moral likeness and life of the regenerating Spirit—the other is artificial, in which nothing is received except a symbolical cleansing and a nominal relation to Christ.

2. It may be further stated that water, and no other physical agent, has in itself, or by any quality imparted to it, any power to act upon mind, and therefore cannot *change* or *renew* it. Such a thing is simply an impossibility, according to any known laws of physics or of mind.

But, as has been said, baptism is a physical act and cannot be the condition of regeneration. God never made it so. To make a physical act a condition of a moral change is an absurdity. Mental acts or states may be the conditions of moral changes, and even of physical changes, but physical acts can not be the conditions of moral changes.

To produce such changes upon such conditions is to work a miracle, and such a miracle, too, as is not recorded in the Bible. A similar process applied to all those texts in which water and the Spirit are associated with remission, renewal, salvation, etc., would give substantially the same results, and therefore will not, in this connection, be attempted.

As with water and the Spirit, so it is with repentance and baptism, or faith and baptism.

Faith and repentance are so intimately connected, both in psychology and in theology, that they are not often

discriminated in the Scriptures. A man cannot have repentance unto life without faith, nor believe to the saving of the soul without repentance. We do not believe and then repent, or repent and then believe. They are concurrent states and activities of the mind, and mutually imply each other. Hence both are rarely named, in the same texts, as antecedent to remission or salvation. Hence Peter, in his first sermon to the Jews, used the word repent (Acts ii, 38). In his first to the Gentiles he sets forth faith as the condition of remission (Acts x, 43).

In the first instance, faith is implied; in the latter, repentance is implied; but taken conjointly or seperately, they *do not*, and from the nature of the case, *cannot*, stand in the same logical relation to remission and salvation that baptism does. Faith and baptism are coördinates in no sense, one being a mental and the other a physical act, and of course cannot be the coördinate conditions of any event, especially of a moral or spiritual change. Hence any interpretation that can be put upon Acts ii, 38, or Mark xvi, 16, or Titus iii, 5, making baptism a condition of remission or salvation, necessarily involves not only the idea of physical regeneration, but of miraculous regeneration.

God, in dealing with the human mind, certainly works through the established laws of mind, and not in violation of these laws, as the doctrine of baptismal regeneration requires us to believe. On the contrary, if we accept faith or repentance as the condition of remission or salvation, and baptism as the divinely appointed expression of purifying faith and symbol of regeneration, we bring the whole scheme of salvation into complete harmony with the established laws of mind, and effectually free it from the pre-suppositon of all physical and miraculous agency.

3. Texts that present *water baptism*, or *type baptism alone*. It will be readily granted by all, that if baptismal regeneration is taught in the Scriptures at all, it may be found in such texts as Acts ii, 38: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This text belongs properly to the preceding class of texts, as it makes reference both to

water and to the Spirit. These, however, are not here put in the same verbal relation to remission of sins. It is generally regarded as standing in the first rank as a proof-text by those who believe in water regeneration, claiming that the doctrine is so clearly taught that nothing short of utter stupidity or incorrigible perverseness could cause any one to doubt it. Let us, however, test its value. It seems to us too doubtful as to its real meaning, to be made the basis of a theory, being capable of various interpretations.

(a) It is maintained by some, with much plausibility, that those Jews that asked, "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" were pious men, who, while they believed in a prophetic Messiah, had ignorantly rejected Christ, as did their rulers; but having witnessed the wonderful effects of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, and having heard Peter's sermon, were convinced of their mistake, were filled with remorse, and desired now to know what duty required of them.

It is favorable to this view, that these enquirers called the apostles *brethren*; did not say what shall we do *to be saved*, as did the jailer (Acts xvi, 30); did not say a word about salvation, nor did Peter promise them salvation, but commanded them to repent and be baptized and promised the gift of the Holy Ghost. [The gift of the Holy Ghost refers to his miraculous influence, such as was experienced by the apostles that morning, and may or may not have included his ordinary and regenerating power.] If they were not previously converted, then of course the regenerating power of the Spirit was vouchsafed to them. If previously converted, then they were appropriately commanded to repent of their great sin, as David was required to repent of his "in the affair of Uriah," and as Peter for his denial of his Lord, and as all Christians, when they commit sin, are required to do. They, on this hypothesis, as well as on any other, were required to be baptized, as a public declaration of their faith in the risen Christ, and as a symbol of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

There is much plausibility in this theory, but I do not assert it *to be true*; but I do assert it *very difficult to prove it false*.

(b) Again, the word *for* ($\epsilon\zeta$) in the adjunct, "for the remission of sins," is exceedingly equivocal. To say that it is taken in the sense of "in order to," or procuratively, is a sheer assumption.

In the New Testament $\epsilon\zeta$ occurs several hundred times, and very rarely is it equivalent to "*in order to*." Hundreds of examples of a contrary usage might be given. A few will suffice. Matt. vi, 34: "Take no thought for ($\epsilon\zeta$) the morrow." The constructions are the same. Thought-taking is not to procure *the morrow*, but is *in reference to the morrow*.

Analogy, of course, would say that Peter means be baptized in reference to remission.

Again, 1 Cor. x, 2: "And were all baptized unto ($\epsilon\zeta$) Moses," etc.

The constructions are exactly the same: baptized for ($\epsilon\zeta$) the remission and baptized unto ($\epsilon\zeta$) Moses. The Hebrews were not baptized in order to procure Moses, but were changed in their faith in relation to him. The text denies our right to say that the baptism administered on Pentecost was to procure remission.

Again, Mark I, 4: "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for ($\epsilon\zeta$) the remission of sins."

Here we have exactly the same construction and exactly the same words: "Be baptized for ($\epsilon\zeta$) the remission of sins;" "baptism of repentance for ($\epsilon\zeta$) the remission of sins."

Now the same words in the same combination, and used in relation to the same subject, cannot be allowed to express contradictory ideas. If John's baptism was procurative of remission, then of course this baptism, commanded by Peter, was intended to procure remission. But if John's baptism was declarative of remission, then of course that commanded by Peter was also declarative of remission. But John did not baptize to procure either repentance or forgiveness, as has been previously shown.

Hence it is certain, if Scripture can be allowed to be its own interpreter, that Peter did not mean to enjoin baptism as a condition precedent to remission, but as an act publicly

and outwardly declarative of regeneration and of consecration to Christ.

4. But suppose the force of these facts could be set aside, and it made clear that the preposition *for* (*εἰς*) is to be taken in a procurative sense, still other difficulties would have to be settled before the text could be made to teach baptismal regeneration. The text itself does not give us to understand whether the adjunct, *for the remission of sins*, modifies the word *be baptized* or the word *repent*, or *both*. It might do any one of these three things according to the sense.

The text, then, as has been seen, is capable of six different interpretations, and the least probable of these is that one made in the interest of baptismal regeneration.

A doubtful text requires to be interpreted in the light of the less doubtful. This is a universally admitted rule; and, as has already been shown in part, this text, when so interpreted, gives no countenance to water regeneration. Still the text shows that water baptism sustains some divinely instituted relation to remission, regeneration; but as will be subsequently shown, it has no saving relation.

Another text of this class is Mark xvi, 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

It was shown above that faith and baptism are not logical coördinates, and cannot occupy the same relation to salvation. The fact that they are put in the same verbal relation signifies nothing to the contrary, as was shown in the case of John iii, 5, and Acts ii, 38.

The paramount importance of faith is clearly indicated by the fact that it is here presented both affirmatively (he that believeth . . . shall be saved) and negatively (he that believeth not shall be damned), while baptism is presented only affirmatively.

Now it is possible for a man to have faith without baptism and be saved, as was the thief on the cross (Luke xxiii, 43); also possible to be baptized without saving faith, as was Simon Magus (Acts viii, 23). These facts show that faith alone saves; that baptism does not save. These results are in exact accord with what a host of other texts teach, such

as Gal. iii, 24: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." In the light of such facts, it is easy enough to see that the true and only defensible interpretation of the language of the great commission is that, by faith men become the children of God and heirs to eternal life, and by baptism into the name of Christ, they become nominally his disciples and members of his visible Church.

A third text belonging to this class is (Acts xxii, 16), "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

We need not here repeat what has already been stated concerning the impossibility of effecting moral changes or of purging the conscience from sin by physical acts or agents. Ananias and Paul, being Jews, knew exactly what a water baptism could accomplish, and what it could not accomplish, and neither of them ever dreamed, we dare say, of its purging the conscience or of its washing away sin, only in a ritualistic sense.

Paul sufficiently explains its power. Heb. x, 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water."

Now, *this heart-sprinkling* and *this body-washing* are respectively explained, the latter in Heb. ix, 13, and the former in the succeeding verse.

We have now noticed the leading texts of this class, and as others less distinctly marked could not give a different result, we premit them and proceed to the consideration of the third class.

III. This class includes those texts that set forth spirit baptism, or antitype baptism, ministered, not by human hands at the behests of human wills to the bodies of men, but is ministered by God himself, revealed as the Holy Spirit to the souls of men; which puts men, not into *the name of Christ*, but which grafts men into Christ, as the branch is grafted into the living vine, whence it draws its life and nurture. We first notice—

The one baptism. Paul, in making an argument against schisms and in favor of keeping "the unity of the Spirit in

the bonds of peace," appeals to the seven grand unities which, as essential factors, all contribute to the efficiency and completeness of the grand scheme of redemption, and the complete unification of Christ and his Church. "There is *one body* and *one spirit*, even as ye are called in *one hope* of your calling: *one Lord*, *one faith*, *one baptism*, *one God and Father* of all who is above all, and through all, and in you all."—Eph. iv, 4-6.

The *one body* is Christ's mystical body, the *one invisible* and *indivisible* spiritual Church.

The *one Spirit* is the Holy Ghost, or God as manifested to the consciousness of true believers—the Comforter and Sanctifier.

The *one hope* is the one glorious and gospel-given hope of eternal life, which is both sure and steadfast.

The *one Lord* is the one God-man, Mediator and Redeemer.

The *one faith* is the one true religion, revealed *from* heaven to bring men *to* heaven.

The *one baptism* is the true, the only true antitype baptism, ministered by God himself as the Holy Spirit, and which is the lexical equivalent of the *new creation* (Eph. ii, 10): the being begotten or born of God (John i, 12, 13); the circumcision made without hands (Col. ii, 11); the sealing to heirship and to the day of redemption by the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv, 30).

This is the baptism to which Paul refers when he says: "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body."—1 Cor. xii, 13. This one baptism, ministered by this one Spirit, puts the believers, not in the name, but into Christ himself—puts them into a state of death unto sin, and life unto God, enabling them "to walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi, 3, 4). To interpret this "one baptism" to mean water baptism—and even one *mode* of baptism, as thousands do, is so absurd as scarcely to deserve a passing notice. The seven (or perfection of) *Divine unities*, of which it is *one*, protest against such an interpretation as an unnatural and even degrading amalgamation of the physical with the spiritual, and of human ministrations with the Divine. This inter-

pretation is, in fact, a relic of the superstitions of the Dark Ages; not a whit less absurd than the doctrine of transubstantiation—born, in fact, of the same parentage, and fostered by the strong propension of the human heart to *formalize* religion, and substitute the outward and sensible for the supersensible and spiritual, the shadow for the substance.

As Dr. Dale has clearly demonstrated in his noble work on baptism, the word is an immodal one—is indifferent to modality, but imperatively calls for effect, and hence whatever can change the state or condition of a thing can baptize that thing. As water can cleanse physically and also by appointment ceremonially, so God alone can cleanse, purify, and save a corrupt human soul. This word baptism was selected by Inspiration to express both these ideas—the formal ceremonial cleansing and the spiritual cleansing, the two sustaining to each other the relation of type and antitype.

Hence, this spirit or antitype baptism is the divinely selected generic word which expresses the whole of that grand spiritual change of the human heart, which alone can save it from sin and death.

All other words used in the Bible as expressive of this change, stand related to this word baptism in its highest sense, as do the species to the genus. It includes them all and accepts them all as its servitors, by which its ends are secured; just as any *immodal* word accepts the agency of any *modal* word by which its end may be accomplished; just as the word *travel* accepts the actions expressed by walking, riding, flying, etc., as the means by which the traveling is accomplished. In like manner, spirit baptism accepts the agency expressed by such verbal forms as *new creation*, *being born from above*, *born of God*, *circumcision made without hands*, *quickened by the Spirit*, *crucified to the world*, *death unto sin*, etc., renewal of the Holy Ghost, putting off the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new man. These various forms of expression denote the different phases of the Divine operation in bringing about this great moral and spiritual change, called spirit or antitype baptism.

This fact becomes evident from the fact that these forms of expression relate precisely to the same great change; also from the fact that they express substantially the same change denoted by this spirit baptism in such texts as 1 Cor. xii, 13; Rom. vi, 3; Col. ii, 12, etc. But it is absolutely crushing to every theory of water regeneration, that the agency to which these radical changes—many in form but one in fact—is not water, but God or the Holy Spirit.

In confirmation of this important truth, let us note a few instances.

1. This baptized or changed state of the soul is represented as a new creation. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature."—2 Cor. v, 17. "Neither circumcision avail-eth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."—Gal. vi, 15. "His *workmanship created* in Christ Jesus."—Eph. ii, 10. "And *be renewed* in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man which after God is *created* in righteousness and true holiness."—Eph. iv, 23, 24.

This new creation, which secures to the soul the image of the creator, is always ascribed to God. How an external physical act, such as baptism, can create the image of God is utterly inconceivable.

2. The subjects of this moral change are represented as being begotten or born of God. John i, 11-13: "He came to his own and his own received him not; but as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name; which *were born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

This is the first instance in which the *new birth* is named in the gospel, and if water is an indispensable factor in it, we should reasonably expect to find the fact expressed or implied. But, on the contrary, the terms of the text absolutely exclude all agency except the Divine.

Born again (*ἀνωθεν*) *from above*.—John iii, 3.

"*Born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever."—1 Peter i, 23.

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *born of God*."—1 John v, 1, 2; iii, 9.

These texts are intended to teach that divine nature is imparted to the regenerated soul. It is absurd to suppose this is or can be imparted by water baptism. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.—John iii, 6.

3. This moral change is described as a *quickening* or bringing the soul from a state of moral and spiritual death to a state of spiritual life. (Ps. LXXI, 21; LXXX, 18; Eph. ii, 1, 5.) This excludes the possibility of physical agency. As well might we expect the leopard to change his spots or the Ethiopian to change his skin, as to expect the man *dead in trespasses and in sins* to be quickened or raised to spiritual life by any physical agency or acts of his own.

4. This change is also called adoption. (Rom. viii, 14-16; Gal. iv, 5, 6.)

5. It is also called a sealing with the Holy Spirit of promise—a sealing unto the day of redemption. (2 Cor. i, 21, 22; Eph. i, 13; iv, 30.)

This new creation, this *being born from above*, or of God; this Divine *quickening*, this *adoption to heirship* with Christ, this *sealing* to the day of redemption, are all expressive of different aspects of this grand moral and spiritual change, and are all attributed to Divine agency alone. The nature of this agency, and of the soul upon which it acts, and of the change itself, all preclude the idea that water can have any essential agency in it.

[To be continued.]

ART. V.—*Individual Immortality: The Problem of the Ages.*

I hope to go hence to good men.—*Socrates.*

Having a desire to depart and be with Christ.—*Paul.*

Neither can they die any more.—*Revelation.*

Of all the problems which occupy the mind of man, no other is of so vast importance to himself as that here proposed for consideration—*Individual Immortality*. If man is destined to live after the dissolution of his body, self-conscious and capable of pain and pleasure; if that state of being is of endless duration; and especially if in that state his condition, as one of happiness or misery, is the outcome of his faith and his conduct in this world, the *knowledge* of these great truths must stand in vital relation to his well being for time and eternity. Toward the solution of this problem the most gifted minds have bent their loftiest powers of research and logic, and our common humanity has yearned for the solution of it, even as the hungry yearn for bread. To-day, as through all the past ages, the human heart inquires with inexpressible concern, and in the very language of the Idumean sage, "*If a man die shall he live again?*" On a problem so momentous, is uncertainty inevitable to man in this earth-life? Will neither earth, nor sky, nor his own soul yield an unequivocal answer to this questioning? Shall he never stand on the solid rock of unwavering belief? Must he walk on into the very gloom of death, hoping, fearing, conjecturing, but unable to *know* what lies beyond, or whether for him there is any beyond?

Not only is it true that each generation must do its own thinking, and discuss for itself the great principles of philosophy and the problems of life, but special causes impose on the Christian scholar of to-day a new discussion and a new defense of the fundamental beliefs of his religious creed. Within a period comparatively recent, the world's thinkers have laid aside methods of investigation and prin-

ciples of reasoning which had held undisputed sway for many centuries, one of the happy results of which is seen in greatly expanded and rapidly expanding circles of knowledge in the field of physical sciences. By the test of this new method—call it Positive Philosophy, or what we will—and in the light of its vast stores of well ascertained facts and demonstrated principles, the doctrines underlying our holy religion are being tested more severely than ever hitherto, so that honest inquirers, no less than skeptics who love darkness rather than light, are inquiring of religious teachers, What do you *know* as to the existence and attributes of the God you worship? as to the inspiration of your Bible? as to the future life? as to endless rewards and punishments? as to Christ and his atoning work? This spirit of inquiry—and no lover of truth can object—is bent on digging down to the very foundations of Christianity, to know for itself on what basis rest its great doctrines of God, endless life, heaven and hell. Are religious teachers, who for the most part postulate these great doctrines as the basis of their teachings, aware of the magnitude and the importance of the test to which the very foundations of Christianity are at this very moment being subjected?

It does not follow that the new methods of investigation now brought to bear on great Christian doctrines will necessitate new proofs. The question is rather whether the proofs hitherto relied on can stand the new test. The inquiry of the day justifies the declaration of the religious poet, that

“The proper study of mankind is man”—

man in all the parts of his being; in his relation to the past, the present, and the future; in his origin and his destiny; in his relations to time and eternity. Both his new methods and his stores of knowledge, from whatever fields gathered, are summoned to aid him in an effort, intense, determined, and persistent, to penetrate and reveal, if possible, the mysteries of his own being. The great problem is now approached from the physical side, and the student of Spencer and of his school of thinkers, is laid under the

necessity of studying sensations, emotions, and volitions, as mixed up with, and dependent on, cells, nerves, brain, and protoplasm. Can the doctrine of *Individual Immortality* stand the test of this new method of studying mental phenomena? What grounds of belief hitherto relied on, remain with unimpaired integrity? Man's nature, his hopes, his capabilities, his beliefs, and his surroundings, are all sources of considerations legitimately bearing on the great question in hand.

1. The existence of a general belief in all historic and traditionary times and among all races, that man is destined to live after the death of the body, is in itself a strong presumption that the belief is founded in truth.

This belief, deep-rooted, wide-spread, and so persistent, has been firmly held and clearly taught by the most gifted and most cultivated minds of the most highly civilized and enlightened nations of the world, while there is scarcely a tribe so degraded as not to hold it in some crude form. Seneca reflected the belief of his day when he said that immortality is "that which our wise men do promise." Homer's invocation, in the opening sentence of the immortal *Iliad*, implores the muse to sing the wrath which dismissed to the shadowy land the *souls* of brave heroes slain in the Trojan war, while their *bodies* were a prey for beasts and birds. The wife of Achilles cremated herself in order to enter at once on the enjoyment of immortality along with her husband. Not only is the poetry of all time full of this sentiment of immortality, but as an operative, vivifying faith, overmastering all other impulses, it has stimulated man to the loftiest deeds of patriotism, self-sacrifice, and devotion to religious duty. It has come down upon the sea of human thought and feeling, as the influence of the heavenly bodies upon the waters of the ocean, drawing, moving, exciting to ceaseless activity. Though so firmly assured of the existence of the life beyond the gloom of death, as to the nature and conditions of that life, unaided reason is shut up to hopeless conjecture; and hence the countless details of the one generic faith, from the rude conception which leads a heathen nation to slay the war-

stead of a fallen chieftain, that it may serve him in the spirit-land, and to slay captives that they may there be his waiters, to the lofty conceptions of the Christian philosopher. The remarkable character of the following sentiments of Tully, who has been designated as the wisest of the Roman philosophers, is a sufficient apology for the length of the extract—sentiments that so much resemble those of a dying Christian, as to justify the belief that they have a common source. Speaking to Scipio and Laelius, in his *De Senectute*, he says: "I do not see why I may not freely declare to you what my thoughts are concerning death, for perhaps I may discern better than others what it is, because I am, by reason of my age, not far from it. I believe that the fathers, those eminent persons, and my particular friends, are still alive, and that they live a life which only deserves the name of life. Nor has reason only and disputation brought me to this belief, but the famous judgment and authority of the chief philosophers." Then, having named Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato, he breaks into this rapturous exclamation: "Oh! glorious day, when I shall go unto the great council and assembly of spirits; when I shall go out of this tumult and confusion, and quit the sink of this world; when I shall be gathered to all the brave spirits who have left this world, and meet with Cato, the greatest and best of mankind!"

The Hebrews had their sheol, to which common receptacle were gathered both the good and the bad, and out of which, at the resurrection of the body, each were to emerge, the one to a state of perpetual bliss, the other to one of misery. The Greeks had their *Hades*, with a compartment for the good and another for the bad—a term and an idea adopted by the Hellenistic Jews, and employed by Christ in his representation of the widely different states of Dives and Lazarus, the former of whom lifted up his eyes in (*Hades*) hell, and saw Abraham "afar off, with Lazarus in his bosom." The common idea located Hades beneath the surface of the earth, and hence Josephus, in speaking of the Pharisees, says, "They believe souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and

punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life." So the Romans had their *Erebus*, or common receptacle of the departed, with its *Elysium* for the good and *Tartarus* for the bad.

Whence, let us ask, first came a belief now so general as to be limited to no particular clime or people, that underlies all the religions of the world, and is so deep-rooted that nothing can quench it? This question of the origin of the belief of immortality has engaged and baffled the wisest men of both ancient and modern times. From one of two sources it must have come: (1) by revelation from a higher intelligence, or (2) it has been developed by the mind's own working. If it came by revelation, the question as to its being founded in truth is forever put at rest. The fact that this great belief cannot be traced, as to its origin, to any particular individual, people, or age, together with the fact that all attempts at positive knowledge on the subject have baffled the wisest philosophers, has led many of those most conversant with the history of human opinions to declare that the doctrine of immortality was at first *Divinely communicated* to man, and that in succeeding ages it has been corrupted in proportion as nations have lost the original revelation. If this theory be true, our hope of immortality is grounded on certainty. Knapp, in his "Christian Theology," affirms that heathen nations, long before they had revelation or any philosophy, possessed a firm belief of the continuance of the soul after death, finds the "susceptibility for this faith" in (1) the *love of life*, and (2) *dreams*, in which the dead appeared to them, speaking and acting. But these, if at all grounds of belief, could not have satisfied the thoughtful in any age. If an evolution of the reason, the belief in immortality cannot be one of those primary truths, or intuitions, that antedate all reasoning; and it must therefore be a *conclusion* to premises drawn from man's nature or from his environments. An individual believer may say it was taught him by his parents; they were taught by their parents, and so on; but this mode of thinking gives us no light as to the *origin* of the race-belief in immortality. Some talk of the "*instinct* of immortality," of "*conscious immortality*," and

by other like vague expressions seem to convey the idea that for some indefinable reason the thought, the hope, the belief of life beyond the tomb spontaneously springs up in the soul—a thought that will not down at the soul's bidding. Some such thought seems to thread the beautiful simile in which the poet declares

"A solemn murmur of the soul
Tells of a world to be,
As travelers hear the billows roll
Before they reach the sea."

But, one way or another, the belief of immortality is in the human mind. If from God, it is a true belief. If it is an evolution of the soul, as hands, ears, and eyes are of the body, then, in the language of the evolution philosophy, *What is its function?* If the belief of immortality be groundless, then indeed has evolution evolved a stupendous falsehood, and that, too, in violation of one of its own fundamental laws, as much so as if it were to develop great wings on the back of a creature designed for no other locomotion than creeping upon the earth; and the outcome of the long series of evolutions, from a monad up to man, is the sorry contradiction of a rational creature endowed with hopes and yearnings never to be fulfilled, with affections and aspirations that must utterly perish from lack of objects to gratify them.

2. *The nature of the soul, as an immaterial entity, is relied on as a proof of immortality.* Says Isaac Watts: "When we know cogitation is the prime attribute of a spirit, we infer its immateriality, and thence its immortality." So Tillotson: "No man who owns the existence of an infinite Spirit, can doubt the possibility of a finite spirit—that is, such a thing as is immaterial, and does not contain any principle of corruption." So a theological work of the day: "The first argument for the immortality of the soul, is its immateriality. The soul is a simple, uncompounded, and immaterial substance. Matter cannot think, and where the power of thinking is, there is necessarily a substance different from matter." Now, it must be confessed that as we cannot cognize the *substance that thinks*—the entity called

mind, as to its essence, the terms, "simple," "uncompounded," and "immaterial," are predicables that convey no definite meaning. What then?

One class of psychologists tell us that what we call soul is only phenomenal, and the only *substratum* is matter. Oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen, in complex union, form protoplasm, and all life is evolved from protoplasm, so that in whatever form life appears, "whether fungus or oak, worm or man," it is homogeneous, and man perishes as utterly as the worm, the oak, the fungus. Here is the hope the materialism of the day offers man in his yearnings for a life beyond! As the liver secretes bile, so the brain secretes perceptions, emotions, volitions; and these phenomena are soul, the "imaginary substratum of natural phenomena." Says Tyndal: "Not alone the mechanism of the human body, but that of the human mind itself—emotion, intellect, will, and all their phenomena, were once latent in a fiery cloud;" and, of course, with the resolution of the material brain into lifeless atoms, all mental phenomena disappear, and of an entity called soul there remains not the shadow of a trace! One step further: let the atoms of the "fiery cloud" be inherently endowed with a force that, self-efficient and self-directed, has evolved the now existing *Cosmos*, and we have the pure material atheism of the day!—a doctrine that makes God a myth, resolves the human soul into evanescent phenomena, and utterly abolishes all idea of moral government. And this—it must be confessed, though to be deplored—is the doctrine that to-day perplexes honest souls with unwelcome doubts, and is carrying multitudes to the fatal issues of lives of sensual gratification.

The assault on the doctrine of a future life by the materialistic philosophy is in reality an old one, for it may be truthfully said that materialism has not gained an inch of solid ground, in the way of premises for its conclusions, since the days of the heathen poet Lucretius, who taught that—

"With matter ample, space, and causal force,
Formation follows as a thing of course."

The gathered stores of knowledge in the domain of physical sciences—the microscope, the telescope, and chemical analysis having done their utmost, furnish no solution of the problem as to whence comes the *causal force*, or what it is. The whole school of philosophers are compelled to acknowledge that at this point materialism is utterly and hopelessly short of any explanation of the real problem issue—that “causal force” which efficiently evolves the phenomena of the living world. Tyndal fairly states the case in his conclusion that “the whole process of evolution is the manifestation of a Power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man.” “As little in our days,” he adds, “as in the days of Job, can man by searching find this Power out.” Tyndal himself seems to have felt obliged to confess that materialistic atheism brought him to the brink of a chasm hopelessly dark, for, in his own experience, “in hours of clearness and vigor, this doctrine ever dissolves and disappears, as offering no solution of the mystery in which we dwell, and of which we form a part.”

The properties that we call form, impenetrability, inertia, attraction, no more certainly imply the existence of a *substratum* in which they inhere, and which we call matter, than do the phenomena of thought, emotion, volition imply the existence of a *substratum* in which they inhere, and this we call mind. Matter is an entity. Mind is an entity. If we must doubt the existence of one, it must be matter; for we cannot believe that matter *is*, without assuming that there is a mind which believes it. In and through the wonderful organism called the body, mind becomes tangent to matter—takes a bearing on matter, cognizes it, controls it. The material pen that traces this line is moved by the bony structure clasping it, the bones are moved this way and that by the muscles, the muscles contract in response to nerve stimulus, and nerves of muscular motion receive their stimulus from the anterior part of the spinal cord, and the response of this cord to volitions is dependent on its connection with the brain. Another set of nerves convey impulses inward, from their perimeters up to the brain, and sensations result. But when the physiologist tells us all this,

and measures the rate at which the impulse travels along the afferent and efferent nerves, and solves his own "personal equation," he has given us not one ray of light in reference to that something which is susceptible of these sensations, which compares them as to their intensity, or notes them as agreeable or disagreeable, and which determines when an impulse, and what degree of impulse, is to be transmitted, along what nerve trunk, and to what point—that something to which bones, muscles, nerves, spinal cord, and brain, along with the pen, stand in the relation of an instrument. Now, the further we travel along this path of reflection, the firmer, it seems to the writer, will be the ground on which rests the belief that mind is, and *must be*, something beyond and above the material organism, and that this something may survive the dissolution of that organism, may take to itself a new and vastly superior organism, and one endowed with immortality.

3. The desire for immortality, common to the race, is a strong presumption in favor of immortality. The thought cannot be put more forcibly than Addison has expressed it in his "Cato:"

"It must be so; Plato, thou reasonest well!
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This *longing after immortality*?
Or whence this secret dread and inward horror
Of falling into nought? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man!"

If we believe our Creator is wise and good, we cannot believe that he has planted this unquenchable desire in the human breast only to mock a rational creature with delusive hopes. Man asks for bread—the bread of eternal life. Will his Maker give him a stone—the extinguishment of his deepest soul-yearnings? We cannot believe it. Man reverently claims the boon of endless life from him who permitted him to taste of life, and implanted a burning desire for its continuance. The petitions of millions of

hearts—the remonstrance, we may say—goes up to God in the words of Tennyson :

“Thou wilt not leave us in the dust ;
Thou madest man, he knows not why ;
He thinks he was not made to die ;
And thou hast made him ; thou art just.”

4. The soul of man bears the image of God. The proof of this proposition is not here to be drawn from revelation, but from the nature of the soul and from what we know of God through his works. The soul demands the existence of God, comprehends the works of God, enters into the thoughts of God. The author of the xix Psalm, gazing upon the countless stars that blaze in the clear Judean sky, exclaimed, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork!” Under similar circumstances Kepler exclaimed, “O God! I think thy thoughts after thee!” As Noah Porter asserts in his able work, the “Human Intellect,” “*The rational methods of the Divine and the human intellect must be the same.*” In its power to know, to will, to plan, to execute, the finite human mind is like to the infinite Divine mind. So far as we can know, the purpose to be served by the creation of the soul requires the perpetual existence of that soul. Stupendous thought!—that the human soul, redeemed from sin, understanding the thoughts and purposes of the Almighty, and loyal to his government, has entered upon an endless upward progress, to be forever an active member in the vast empire of mind of which the Omniscient Wisdom is the center and ruler. Truly, “It doth not yet appear how great we shall be made,” for in the human soul lie infinite possibilities, and the realizations of its future may far transcend the loftiest aspirations of the present.

5. The capacity for immortality is a prophecy of immortality. The bud is a prophecy of the bloom, the bloom of the fruit. A bud contains elements that develop into bloom and fruit. An acorn is an embryotic oak. Now, it is admitted that we cannot so know the soul as an entity, as to find in its constitution the very elements of the life to be, after death dissolves the body, yet there is an analogy

between the development of the bud into bloom and fruit, and the soul's transition from earth life to the supposed future and endless life. The bud is not an end in itself, the bloom is not. As each looks to something beyond, and has in itself the elements of that something, so the individual human being has capacity for something after and superior to this earth-stage of existence, and that *capacity* for something beyond and higher justifies the belief that there is such a stage of existence. The body indeed is under the laws of growth, maturity, decline, and dissolution. An evanescent vortex of shifting atoms, it is doomed to return to the "dust" from which the life-force within gathered, and temporarily holds the elements in organization. But we mean to say that the soul does not exhibit this inevitable tendency to extinction or dissolution. Long after the bodily powers begin to decline, and sometimes until the very moment of bodily dissolution, the soul goes on increasing in vigor and activity, rising at last on unwearied wing, as if pluming itself for an endless flight. Facts of this kind are well known to medical men, and more than one skeptic has been converted at the bedside of the dying. The wonderful power of memory, for instance, as often displayed in the extreme moment of mortal life, serves well to illustrate the point in hand, instances of which are cited by a writer in *Chamber's Journal*, as given by Dr. Carpenter and others. "Sometimes," says this writer, "the whole history of a lifetime will be flashed before the mind as in an instantaneous picture. It may be that this occurs very frequently before actual death; but this we cannot know, as all the instances of which we have account are those in which a man has described his sensations after having been saved from dying—especially from drowning." Why may not such be the experience of every dying man whose soul, from that "point of death," passes beyond the veil, instead of remaining on this side? The following statement, by the writer above quoted, presents a fact of solemn import—a fact that should startle those who flatter themselves that annihilation will end their history of evil doing, for, says he, "when all hope of being saved is gone, and the very struggle with the water is now

made without conscious effort, it would seem that without being prompted by the will, the memory suddenly grasps at once the deeds of the life that appears about to close, and at the same time—and this is the most singular fact of the phenomenon—recognizes the usual rectitude or wrong of each act." In connection with the foregoing, is related the experience of an English naval officer who, while struggling in the wake of a ship from which he had fallen, seemingly remembered the events of his life, and confessed himself specially impressed by the vivid recollection of a childhood lie told to his mother.

Does a wise man build a ship and load it with valuable wares, only to leave it, with its grand spread of sail, to rot in the dock? Is the human soul, with its stores of gathered knowledge, with its disciplined powers, with its broad experiences, coming to the close of the earth-life and standing on the shore of endless existence, with yearnings to be loosed and to sail away—is the soul in that moment to sink into everlasting unconsciousness? Who can so believe it?

6. Man's moral nature necessitates a future life—that is, if we are to believe man a part of a harmonious system of things. Granted that God is, and is just, it follows that what *ought* to be *will* be. Surely it is apparent to all reflecting men that this present life affords no consummation of human destiny in its relation to reward and punishment, and that the very principles we now see to be in operation demand a future in which to work out their righteous issues; so that upon the ground of evolution, a future for the human soul seems an undeniable demand. If, as Spencer tells us, the "religious idea" is in the progress of every people a "necessary development," why shall we not believe that a future state of rewards and punishments will come as a natural development of those moral laws to which man is now subject, just as certainly as matter is subject to inertia and gravitation? Such a conclusion, it seems to us, if development means anything, is undeniable—that the soul shall live on in its obedience and happiness, or in its disobedience and misery. Matter, we are taught to believe, is indestructible, and force is indestructible,

and the human soul, a moral force in God's universe of moral intelligencies, carries in itself—awful thought!—a moral necessity of self-conscious evolution into unceasing ages. No man can read history, no man can know the events of to-day, and believe in a God, whose impartial justice will reward every man according to his works, without believing also that there is a future state of retribution as the explanation of the otherwise inexplicable state of moral derangement witnessed on the theatre of human action. By a law absolute and inexorable, the present state of things, in which we see truth crucified, justice defeated, crime unpunished, and evil put for good, tends to a future and final adjustment that shall redress the wrongs of the injured and vindicate the moral government of the all-just One.

7. The goodness of God, no less than his justice, affords ground of faith in a future life. Love seeks the happiness of all sentient creatures. Love is preservative. God is love, and, above all other love, the love of God is preservative. As the love of a parent seeks by the most assiduous care, and often by the greatest self-sacrifice, to prolong the life of a child, so will not God's love preserve the life of his children? This is the grandest expression of the divine love, that, when man's rebellion rendered such a thing needful, Jesus Christ veiled himself in mortal flesh and passed through death, in order to give eternal life to all who would believe on him—to give, not continued existence only, but "eternal life," in all the fullness of life sanctified and glorified. Since God's universe is infinite and the resources of his goodness are boundless, will not his love lift our souls up out of the abyss of death, and at his inexhaustible fountain of life satisfy the ceaseless yearnings that here burn within us?

8. The soul of man is related to the infinite. It comprehends the infinite as a necessary. Space is infinite. Duration is infinite. An infinite *first cause*—a "force" that thy physicist demands as the result of an ultimate analysis, a "bottom fact" there *must be*. The skeptic calls it the infinite "unknowable," the Christian calls it Jehovah. Man stands at the head of the earthly creation, able, like his Maker, to

survey the goodly frame. With the telescope he sweeps so far out into the starry depths of heaven that the awful conception of infinitude of space clutches the soul. Turning to his own little sphere, he reads in its rocky strata the records of the past, descending to ages so remote that the conception of infinite duration breaks in upon the soul. I know that I am. There has been an infinite past. There will be an infinite future, and into that infinite future my soul projects its thoughts, its hopes, its loftiest aspirations, its intensest yearnings! In sight of a fountain, ceaseless and infinite, is man deluded by a thirst that is never to be satisfied? Man is fitted to soar and longs to soar—Oh! how intensely he longs to soar!—into the boundless universe that God opens upon his vision, to behold, to enjoy, to adore through the ages of an endless future. Has the infinite, all-wise, loving Creator not made us to be spectators of the ever shifting panorama of his physical universe, as it sweeps everlastingly around his throne? Shall we not go on forever to know his great moral purposes and to be his servants in the economy of his universe of rational creatures? The longer the soul reflects, the less willingly will it relinquish such mighty hopes. The further it travels forward on these paths of legitimate reflection, the firmer will grow the conviction that it was formed to “spring across the abyss of death,” to mount into higher relations to the universe, physical and moral, to clothe itself with immortality.

9. The incompleteness of man's earthly life, as a whole, proves a future. A single bone of an extinct bird or quadruped has enabled the comparative anatomist to frame a complete ideal animal—an ideal more than once verified by the after discovery of the complete skeleton. The comet plunges out of the depths of space into our solar system, or into the remoter field of the telescope, and from the little arc of its orbit determined, the astronomer calculates the direction, distance, and period of the fiery messenger on its “long travel of a thousand years.” So the small arc of our existence that lies within the horizon of our earth-life, discloses that vast orbit of joyous existence through which redeemed souls will ever sweep on missions of love. With-

out another and future state of being, man's existence is indeed enigmatical—a preface without a book, a vestibule without a building, a bud without flower or fruit. “*Now* we see through a glass darkly; but *then* face to face; now I *know* in part, but *then* shall I know even as also I am known.” The “now” demands the “then” as its complement, as its fulfilment. The dim dawning of the morning proclaims the brightness of noonday, and the moral light darting into the morning of our being proclaims the glories of eternal day, when the mortal shall put on immortality and death be swallowed up in victory.

In another light is the value, the blessedness, of a rational Christian faith, more truly manifest than in relation to the doctrine of individual immortality, and that too, whether we consider this doctrine in its power to elevate, to dignify, and to comfort the individual believer, or in its restraining power over society and the nation, for truly has Canon Farrar said, “If religion fail to save the world from wickedness, God only knows what atheism will do.” The materialistic philosophy may temporarily carry the unthinking masses away from the restraints of morality and religion into the most direful excesses of sensual indulgence, but the truth will assert itself in the soul of every man who walks with God, and such shall have within himself the witness that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, he has a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

A. B. MILLER.

ART. VI.—*Exegetical.*

1 PETER III, 18, 19.

THIS is confessedly an obscure passage. Volumes have been written upon it; and in respect to its meaning the Church has long been divided in opinion. Whichever one of several views we may hold, however, it ought scarcely to be taken as a test of our orthodoxy. Especially in regard to such a passage as this should we be careful that our dogmatics do not influence our exegesis. As a Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopalian, I may prefer one interpretation rather than another, but it is by no means this preference which entitles me, even in part, to be called a Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopalian.

The following is a brief statement of the principal views held as to the meaning of this scripture:

1. During the interval between the crucifixion and the resurrection, Christ, in *his own person*, preached to the good in the spirit world (*Hades*). This was the opinion held by many of the ancient fathers; as Marcion, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Isidorus, Gregory the Great, and the Greek Church. Among the scholastic theologians, it was advocated by Anselm, Albertus, and Thomas Aquinas. Zwingle defends the same view, and maintains that the message preached to the "spirits in prison" (the Old Testament saints) was the gospel of redemption. They could not come into heaven proper before Christ, because he must have in all things the preëminence. This conclusion was based upon an exegesis (unsound, we suppose) of John III, 13, and Col. I, 18. This is substantially the view held by the Roman Catholic Church, though on theological rather than exegetical grounds. It has long taught that Christ descended, not to the abode of evil spirits, but to the intermediate state (*Limbus patrum*), occupied by the believers who died before the Incarnation. The Sacraments of the Old Testament, it teaches, "simply signified grace,

while those of the New actually convey it." Hence the Old Testament saints were not saved at death, but passed into a sort of negative existence in *Hades*, and the object of Christ's descent was to announce to them the tidings of complete deliverance. Bishop Browne, of the Church of England, thinks that the soul of Christ went and proclaimed to the old patriarchs in the spirit world "that their redemption had been fully effected, that Satan had been conquered, and that the great sacrifice had been offered up." So, also, Bishop Horsley.

2. Christ preached in the spirit world to both the good and the wicked. Maintained by Athanasius, Ambrose, Erasmus. Calvin says: "The apostle amplifies the efficacy of the death of Christ from this consideration, that it penetrated even to the dead; when the souls of the faithful enjoyed the present view of that visitation which they had been anxiously expecting; whilst, on the contrary, it was more clearly discovered to the reprobate, that they were excluded from all salvation. He only designs to inform us that the knowledge of the death of Christ was common to them both." This seems to be Calvin's view of *ἐκφύξεν* (*preached*). We are not to understand that he believes Christ *literally* descended into hell. By the phrase, "descended into hell," is meant that "invisible and incomprehensible vengeance which he suffered from the hand of God." (See Inst., bk. II, ch. 16, secs. 9, 10.) Christ suffered for us both in body and soul, and so intense was his soul-suffering that it might be called a literal descent into hell.

3. Christ preached in the spirit world to the wicked only. Flacius, Calovius, Buddeus, Wolf, and other Lutheran theologians, "make the burden of Christ's preaching an announcement of condemnation." Others make it a manifestation of himself as Redeemer. Luther spoke doubtfully. At first he supposed a *limbus patrum*, or intermediate state to which Christ went. Later, he asserts that "Christ destroyed the power of the devil and hell, whither he went with soul and body." Following "the godly teaching of Dr. Luther," the framers of the Formula of Concord adopt the doctrine of "Christ's descent into hell" as an article of

faith; but they do not seek to explain it, further than to make it a part of Christ's exaltation, rather than of his humiliation. He descended into hell, not that he might suffer its torments, but that he might destroy the power of the devil and of hell, and proclaim his victory. (See Article IX, Form. Con.)

4. Christ, in the person of the apostles, preached to "the spirits in prison." So the celebrated Grotius, who makes the "spirits in prison" mean the Jews and Gentiles who are still in the prison of the body, or the flesh; so, also, Socinus and his disciple Schlichting, who make the same phrase mean "in the prison of sin." This view also is untenable on grammatical grounds, but which we have not space to state here. The great Grotious is not usually found in such company.

5. Christ preached in the person of Noah to the spirits who were alive on the earth in the time of Noah, but were "in prison" at the time the apostle wrote. This is the view held by very many eminent expositors, ancient, medieval, and modern. I have before me the versions of Wicliff, Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Rheims, and King James, made respectively in 1380, 1534, 1539, 1557, 1582, 1611. Wicliff reads as follows: For also Christ once died for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he should offer to God us made dead in flesh, but made quick in spirit; for which thing he came in spirit, and also to them which were (closid to gidæ) in prison preached. The translators of the Geneva supply the word *are* thus: And preached unto the spirits which *are* in prison. Tyndale, Cranmer, and Rheims, agree with our authorized version: "For Christ also hath once (*ἀπαλ*, only once) suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death (*θανατωθεῖς*) in the flesh (*σαρκί*), but quickened (*ζωοποιμθεῖς*) by the spirit (*πνευματι*); by which (*ἐν ᾧ*) he also went and preached (*ἐκρυξεν*) to the spirits in prison." It is sufficient to say, without entering into details here, that it is believed the grammatical and lexical principles which control the rendering of the Greek justifies this translation. There is nothing in it which forbids the following paraphrase: For Christ also hath once suffered, a just

person for the unjust, and the reason why he was put to death as to his human nature, but made alive by his divine nature, was that he might bring many sons unto God: in which divine nature he preached in the person of Noah to the spirits who were alive on the earth at that time, but are now (at the time of the apostle's writing) in prison. In Eph. ii, 17, he is said to have come and preached to those who "were afar off," which he did, certainly, only in the person of his apostles. So in this case, in the person of Noah. See also 1 Peter i, 11; 2 Peter ii, 5.

In the creeds of the Churches, the clause, "*He descended into hell*," stands thus: It first occurs in the creed of the church of Aquileia, A. D. 390. After this it appears in the Creed of Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, A. D. 590. It was inserted in the creed of the Church of Rome between the fifth and eighth century. It became a part of the received text of the Apostle's Creed, A. D. 750, and is adopted from it by all the Churches. It occurs in two of the three creeds in the Church of England, viz: the Apostle's Creed and the Creed of Athanasius. It does not occur in the Nicene or Constantinople Creeds. In America, the "Book of Common Prayer" leaves it optional with the Episcopal minister to use in the Creed, *hell*, or *the place of departed spirits*—which last expression, however, is not much better than the former. Three different interpretations have been put upon the clause, as follows: 1. According to the Westminster divines, He descended into hell, means, He continued in a state of death and under the power of death until the resurrection. See the Creed and the explanation given at the conclusion of the Shorter Catechism. This view is not the one now received by Presbyterian divines. 2. It signifies the intense mental agony which Christ suffered in dying. So, Calvin as above mentioned. See also the Heidelberg Catechism, Ques. 44. 3. Christ actually appeared after his crucifixion to all the departed spirits. This was the belief generally held by the ancient fathers, but they differed in opinion as to his employment during his absence.

R. V. FOSTER.

ART. VII.—*Editorial.*

THE General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church at Memphis, Tennessee, in May, 1879, directed the Board of Publication at Nashville, to transfer the Quarterly, known as *The Theological Medium*, to the Agent and Theological Faculty of Cumberland University, they agreeing to continue its publication; the Board of Publication to complete the volume closing with the October number, 1879.

We enter upon the work with this number. We did not begin the work until the latter part of October, and have consequently been very much hurried in getting the matter ready for the press, so as to have it out in time to reach subscribers by the 1st of January.

We have thought it advisable to change the name from *The Theological Medium* to THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY. We do this, not to make its literature more denominational in its character, but to more clearly indicate the denominational character in the name. We hope this will meet the approbation of the General Assembly and of all the members of the Church.

It is our purpose to make the QUARTERLY worthy of the patronage of the whole Church, and of Christians and scholars generally. We hope to have the coöperation of all who desire the success of this effort to do good.

The QUARTERLY will be published in the interest of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, but we will endeavor to maintain a broad and catholic Christian spirit.

We expect to have the assistance of the best writers in the Church as contributors to the QUARTERLY, and although it is under the control of men who are connected with Cumberland University, it is for the whole Church—East, West, North, and South—and we trust that every member of the Church will feel a Church pride in its success.

The Theological Medium has done a noble work for the Church and the cause of Christianity. It has a history of

which every Cumberland Presbyterian ought to be proud. The names of Bird, Blake, and DeWitt, as the Editors in the different periods of its history, will always have a warm place in the great heart of the Church.

As the Church grows stronger, may not its theological QUARTERLY become more and more useful—a greater power in the hands of God? Will not every Cumberland Presbyterian say, It shall be so?

ART. VIII.—*Literary Notices.*

LIVES OF THE LEADERS OF OUR CHURCH UNIVERSAL, edited by Dr. Ferdinand Piper, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, and Rev. Dr. Henry M. MacCracken, Pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Toledo, Ohio.

This is a new octavo volume of eight hundred and fifty-six pages, closely printed, containing brief sketches of the lives and labors of the leading men in the Church from the beginning of the Christian dispensation down to our own time. These leaders are, with a few exceptions, taken from the ranks of the ministry. The exceptions are such men as Caligny, the Huguenot leader in France, and a victim of the massacre of Saint Bartholomew; William of Orange, and King Alfred of England. The catalogue contains, also, sketches of two or three distinguished females, two of whom are Mrs. Isabella Graham and Mrs. Elizabeth Fry. These good women were, in the fullest sense, benefactresses of their time, and deserve a place wherever great worth is recorded. Altogether, it is as good a selection of subjects as could have been made from the Church in the several ages through which it has passed. The first subject is Simeon of Jerusalem, our Lord's kinsman, and the successor of

James, the Lord's brother in the charge of that mother of Christian congregations. Simeon's pastorate is placed at A. D. 109, the length being unknown. The last subject is John Williams, the young missionary who was murdered November 20, 1839, and supposed to have been eaten by cannibals, on one of the New Hebrides Islands. Several of the subjects, however, outlived Williams, although they stand in order before him on the catalogue. Among these was our honored and beloved brother, Rev. Robert Donnell, who has deservedly found a place in the long catalogue of representative men of whom the world was not worthy.

We take great pleasure in recommending this book. It occupies a place of its own. It is catholic in the true sense of the term. It is published in the interest of true Christian unity. It presents us with sketches, as long, perhaps, as would be useful, of a large number of the best men of the ages in which they lived. The sketches are well written. The subjects have certainly furnished material in abundance, and the writers have been under no temptation to go out of the line of sober and unmixed facts in the accomplishment of their task.

AN ILLUSTRATED COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW, for Family Use and Reference, and for the Great Body of Christian Workers of all Denominations, by Rev. Lyman Abbott, author of "Life of Christ," "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge," etc. Volume I. A. S. Barnes & Co., New York, Chicago, and New Orleans. 1878.

This work has been forwarded to us by the well known house of A. S. Barnes & Co., together with a Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, the two forming the first and the third of a series of eight volumes on the New Testament, the Commentary on Mark and Luke forming the second volume of the series. The fourth volume comprises the Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. These, I. to IV, are now complete. The remaining four volumes are in course of preparation. These are of the second series. The first series, as we learn from a notice by the editor, will consist of four volumes, the first including Matthew and Mark and the second Luke and John. We take

it that the two series or sizes contain exactly the same matter, the same type, and pages of the same size, the difference consisting only in the size of the volumes.

The work is printed on excellent paper, 8vo, with clear type, neatly and substantially bound in cloth, beveled.

The work comprises the commentary, with maps, illustrations, an introduction to the study of the New Testament, a condensed life of Christ, and a tabular harmony of gospels, chronological table, and gazetteer.

These appendages to the commentary are of very great value to those who do not choose, or are unable, to purchase larger and more costly works of the kind. In the meantime, they are sufficiently full to answer the purposes of those for whom the work is principally designed.

The author lays down ten different rules by which he proposes to govern himself in his interpretations. These rules are sound and eminently proper, in fact indispensable to the right apprehension and clear elucidation of the texts. As far as we can judge from our cursory examination, he adheres to his plan with scrupulous fidelity.

He follows for the most part Alford's Greek text, but does not hesitate to depart from it when he discovers, after careful study, a sufficient reason for doing so.

By a careful study of the original, he has sought to ascertain the exact literal meaning of the words. This, when it can be determined, always gives the best clue to the ideas intended to be conveyed. He gives, as is eminently proper, the usage of the New Testament and of the Septuagint the preference over the classical usage. To do otherwise would be, in some instances, to replace a Jewish element with a Grecian. Our author holds that a text should not on any account be wrested from its connections or woven into new combinations, and thus, contrary to its design, be made to speak in the interest of a theory in ethics or theology or any favorite ritualistic forms.

This is a good rule, and we think the author has adhered to it more closely than commentators generally do. The Bible gives us no formulated system either of ethics or of theology. It, however, furnishes the materials of these, and

leaves the work of system-building to the philosophers and theologians.

Most commentators, however, feel it incumbent upon them to put every text in harmony with their peculiar views of theology, etc., often taking unwarranted liberties with the sacred text. Hence it happens that our commentators are generally about as strictly denominational as our Confessions of Faith.

Our author is sufficiently deferential to authorities, and has the art of presenting their opinions in a clear and concise form. He, however, shows no servility in this regard, and seldom fails to give his own opinions where authorities differ.

Some writers seem to delight in obscurity. What is in itself plain, they envelop in a fog. What is in itself obscure, they make more so.

Our author, we are pleased to know, does not belong to this class. He conceives clearly and expresses himself lucidly. His propositions are self-interpreting, and the reader is not left to guess at his meaning. His ideas, whether right or wrong, are easily seen. This is one among the many merits of his work.

It is scholarly but not pedantic, critical but not hyper-critical, sufficiently full but not redundant, elaborate but not prolix, and on these accounts is relieved of that dryness which so often characterizes works of this kind.

The commentary is accompanied with frequent notes relating to remarkable events which have a bearing upon the text. In these notes is brought out in a condensed and lucid form, a great deal of valuable information concerning persons, places, the habits, laws, customs, religions, etc., of the Jews and other peoples.

We are acquainted with no work of the kind better suited to family use or to Sabbath-schools. It is also sufficiently full and critical to answer all practical purposes of the ministry. Of course no one expects ever to find a commentary whose teachings he can in every instance approve. While men have the faculty of thinking, they will have the faculty of differing in some respects in their opinions.

L. of C.

Those needing such a work, we think, will hardly do better than to procure Dr. Abbott's Commentary.

For the benefit of our readers, we give the author's comment on Matt. xvii, 1-4—*The Transfiguration*:

"1. *After six days.* That is, subsequent to the prophecies of Christ's death recorded in the previous chapter. All the evangelists give this note of time. Luke says *about an eight days*: possibly he includes both the last day of the preceding conversation, and the day of the transfiguration; or his language *about (ὡσεύ)* may be taken to indicate that he is not and does not claim to be definite.—*Peter, James, and John his brother.* They were Christ's only companions in Gethsemane (Mark xiv, 32-42), and there, as here, they were heavy with sleep. They alone witnessed the resurrection of Jairus' daughter (Mark v, 37; Luke viii, 51). Why was this privilege accorded to them above the others? We can only answer, because it seemed good in their Lord's sight. (Compare John xxi, 22; Rom. ix, 11.) All Christ's disciples did not share the same experience of his glory.—*High mountain.* The site is wholly unknown. See above. He went up to *pray* and *as he was praying* (Luke iii, 21; compare Acts vii, 55, 56; Rev. i, 10).

"2. *And was transfigured before them.* The nature of the transfiguration is indicated by the description which follows, and yet more definitely by the accounts of Mark and Luke. His face shone as the sun; his garments became white '*as the light*' (Matt.) *i. e.*, luminously white, '*as no fuller on earth can white them*' (Mark) *i. e.*, with a supernatural whiteness; '*white and glistening*' (Luke) *i. e.*, flashing. The same Greek word *εζαρπατα* in Luke rendered *glistery*, is used in Nahum iii, 3, to describe spears glittering in the sun, and in Ezekiel i, 7, to describe the brightness of the living creatures '*who sparkled like the color of burnished brass.*' The transfiguration then consisted, apparently, in a luminous appearance which pervaded the whole face and figure of Jesus. (Compare Ex. xxxiv, 29, 30.) As Christ took on him human nature and condition for converse with man, as here, it appears to me, he is represented as taking on the form and condition of the spirits, for the purpose of communion with

the spiritual world. Observe that it took place *before them*, *i. e.*, the disciples, not during their sleep. They saw, not only Christ after he was transfigured, but also the process of change, as it came over him. It is true, Luke's account in our English version, implies that they were asleep, and were wakened out of it to behold the glory (Luke ix, 32), but the original does not justify this interpretation. See notes there.

"3. *There appeared unto them.* That is, to the disciples. The implication is, that they not only saw the appearance, but recognized, in the persons, Moses and Elijah. How this recognition was afforded is not stated; perhaps by a subtle spiritual power of recognition. We often appear to ourselves to recognize in dreams persons we have never seen; why may not the soul, in special spiritual conditions, possess a similar power of recognizing, in reality, unknown persons? That Moses and Elijah were recognized, *at the time*, by the apostles, is evident from Peter's proposition (verse 4).—*Talking with him.* Luke gives the subject of the conversation: 'His decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.' It is worthy of note that Elijah did not die, but was translated, and that Moses' death was shrouded in peculiar mystery (2 Kings ii, 11; Deut. xxxiv, 6). Dr. Brown's comment here is important: 'They speak not of his miracles, nor of his teaching, nor of the honors which he put upon their Scriptures, nor of the unreasonable opposition to him, and his patient endurance of it. They speak not of the glory they were themselves enshrouded in, and the glory he was so soon to reach. Their own subject of talk is his *decease*, which he was going to accomplish at Jerusalem. One fancies that he might hear them say, Worthy is the Lamb that *is* to be slain.'

"*Then answered Peter.* The foremost to speak; awe silences the rest, but not him. Compare with his characteristic impetuosity here, the incidents recorded in John xx, 5, 6; xxi, 7. Luke gives the explanation of his speaking. He spake 'as they (*i. e.*, Moses and Elijah) were departing,' evidently to hinder their departure, and induce them to remain.—*It is good for us to be here.* It often appears to the

Christian to be good to abide with Christ in spiritual exaltation. But such hours are rare, and meant to be. It is better to descend and go about with Christ doing good. The one is often *our wish*, the other is *his will*.—*Let us make*. The better reading appears to be, *I will make*. It is, at all events, an offer of service for the honor of Christ.—*Three tabernacles*. Rather booths, *i. e.*, huts of the branches of the trees, such as Jacob made for his cattle (Gen. xxxiii, 17), and Jonah for a temporary shelter (Jonah iv, 5). At the feast of the tabernacles, the Jews dwelt for a time in such booths, to remind them of their sojourn in the wilderness (Lev. xxiii, 42; Neh. viii, 15, 16). Luke says Peter spake 'not knowing what he said,' and Mark gives the explanation 'for they were sore afraid.' In other words, his was not a well considered proposition, to retain the spirits in earthly tabernacles, but an ardent expression inspired by awe and spiritual ecstasy commingled."

PASTORAL THEOLOGY: THE PASTOR IN THE VARIOUS DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE, by Thomas Murphy, D. D., pastor of the Frankford Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut street.

This is an 8 vo. volume, of 500 pages, printed in large type on good paper, and neatly and substantially bound in black cloth. The writer, Dr. Murphy, has been a pastor of a large and growing church for more than a quarter of a century, and has acquainted himself, generally, with the literature of his subject.

His chief reliance for material has been upon his own observations and experience. He, however, quotes with sufficient freedom from the best authors on the subject in hand.

The book is written in good familiar English—words well selected and collection good, the ideas clearly and rather vigorously expressed.

The predominant characteristic of the style is its earnestness. The author brings to the work a fervid spirit. This relieves the book of that dryness which is characteristic of

most works written on Pastoral Theology, Pulpit Preparations, etc.

The author, in his preface, says, "Though I am a Presbyterian, and have necessarily looked upon every question treated from the standpoint of that system, yet it is believed that nearly every duty indicated, or counsel given, is just as applicable to pastors of other denominations. Some nomenclature had to be used; but, with that exception, the subject, as it lay before me, demanded scarcely anything but what was common to the duties of the ministry of all communions."

In this regard, we think, the author has not misjudged the case; for, though, as was to be expected, he occasionally brings visibly to view, for the most part by implication, rather than by expression, some of the distinctive doctrines of his Church, this is not done in an obtrusive or offensive form. He seems intensely in earnest with his subject and veers neither to the right nor left, to discuss, even incidentally, questions of theology, ritualism, or of church polity. Indeed this rigid adherence to his subject, and the glowing evangelical spirit in which he pursues it, constitute one of the chief excellences, as it is one of the chief attractions of the book. We think it scarcely possible for a young man who feels "woe is me if I preach not the gospel," and who regards the ministry less as a profession than as a mission, less as a station to be filled than as a work to be achieved, to read the book without being both profited and pleased; without falling in love, both with this book and the author.

The book, it should not be forgotten, is the product, not of a theorist, but of a pastor of large experience, who has studied human nature, not so much in his study, as in actual contact with men—men of all vocations, ranks, and conditions. Men of learning and ignorance, of wealth and poverty, in prosperity and adversity, in sickness and in health, in the incipient stages and in the more advanced stages of piety, in the different stages of irreligion and infidelity.

The results of such an experience classified and formulated, become available, to a large extent, by others, and

serve as guides to those who have only small experiences of their own.

Our author has treated the subject largely—as near exhaustively, perhaps, as can be done without entering into trivial and unprofitable details.

We have no hesitation in saying that the book, especially for practical purposes, is superior to any we have read on the subject, and do, most cordially, recommend it to all ministers, old and young, of all denominations, and to all others who may wish to understand the pastor's work, and the best way to perform it.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES OF THE BIBLE, by John W. Haley, M. A., with an Introduction by Avah Hovey, D. D., Professor in the Newton Theological Institution. Third Edition. Andover: Warren F. Draper; Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 1876.

The Bible has been tried as no other book has been tried. It has been a thousand times put into the furnace, heated seven times hotter than it is wont to be; still it has always come out without the smell of fire upon it, and so it will ever do. Every effort to destroy it only makes its indestructibility the more manifest. Of all the hallucinations that ever possessed the human mind, this ever vigilant and ceaseless opposition to the Bible, seems to us the most suicidal, misanthropic, wicked, and withal the most hopeless of good results.

It is given to the world, not less for man's good than for God's glory: given by our Creator, Benefactor, and Father—given for our good, to show us our duty and our interest, to enable us to take care of ourselves in the highest sense of the word. It is neither God nor man. If it could be destroyed and never recovered, God would still live and human nature might live if God should choose to save it from itself.

God and right, man and conscience do not derive existence from the Bible. It reveals God and right—does not create them. It instructs, with most beneficent intentions, men, and helps conscience; does not create them.

Men seem to grow oblivious of the fact that God and right, man and conscience, remorse and retribution, heaven and hell do not depend for existence upon the Bible. To seek to destroy or discredit it is very much as if a man, apprehending danger ahead of him, should instantly imagine that if he could pluck out his eyes, or quench the light of day, he would thereby remove the apprehended danger.

Unreasonable as this opposition is, it is nevertheless easy to understand its source—it springs from a cherished desire to free the mind from a sense of responsibility. Men are afraid of retribution—of hell, of God, and only by persuading themselves that there is no God, no retribution, no hell, can they in any measure hush the hisses of conscience and parry its fangs. Thus they pluck out their eyes in order to remove the cataract from the stream, on whose swift-moving waters they float, fitfully dreaming of a non-retributive feature. But the plunge over the cataract is none the less certain and none the less terrible, because the eyes were plucked out.

That form of infidelity which is the more common, and therefore the more dangerous, consists in the assumption that the Bible is self-contradictory, and therefore false. Thousands of others use the same plea, who have read it only to convict it of self-contradiction. It is moreover true of the most of both these classes that they are incapable of making a logical and well-sustained argument for or against any question whatever. It is against this class of Bible-haters and Bible-abusers that Halvy directs his book.

The book is a small 8 vo., neatly and substantially bound in cloth, containing 473 pages—paper fair and good, type clear and sufficiently large for most eyes.

The words are well chosen, the style natural, free from all affectation and pedantry, concise and logical. The writer seems intent upon the accomplishment of his work, fully sensible of its importance and conscious of his own responsibility. He seems, too, fully adequate to the task to which he felt himself called.

This branch of apologetics is generally treated in connection with other kindred subjects in large works intended

as introductions to the study of the Bible, and consequently not readily accessible to others than clergymen and theological students. Mr. Haley's book is of such a form as to be readily available to all classes.

Many of the alleged discrepancies, discussed by our author, admit of different solutions, and it is often impossible to determine, with absolute certainty, which is the true one. Nor is this necessary, for the utmost that can be required of the apologist is to show that no contradiction exists *from necessity* in the case in hand.

Our author's solutions may not, in every case, be the best possible, but they are generally satisfactory, and are, we think, taken throughout, the best we have seen, and do not hesitate to recommend the book to all that may wish to familiarize themselves with the subject.

We have not space to give an extended analysis of the book. We will, however, briefly indicate the method of treatment—

"I. Origin of these discrepancies. 1. Different dates of passages. 2. Differences of authorship. 3. Differences of standpoint or of object. 4. Different methods of arrangement. 5. Different methods of computation. 6. Peculiarities of Oriental idiom. 8. Plurality of names or synonyms. 9. Errors in manuscripts. 10. Imagination of the critics."

"II. Design of the discrepancies."

Our author assumes that the discrepancies are Divinely permitted for wise and beneficent purposes, such as—

"1. To stimulate the intellect, as provocative of mental effort. 2. They are meant to be *illustrative of the analogy between the Bible and nature*, and so to evince their common *origin*. 3 They were designed as a strong incidental proof, that there was no collusion among the sacred writers. 4. Another object of these discrepancies, it may be presumed, was to lead us to value the Spirit beyond the letter of the Scriptures, to prize the essentials of Christianity rather than its form and accidents. 5. The Biblical discrepancies were plainly appointed as *a test of moral character*; and, probably, to serve an *important judicial purpose*."

These reasons *may all be true*; but we cannot prove them to be so by any very satisfactory method. The discrepancies themselves our author classifies under three general heads—the theological, the ethical, and the historical. The work is furnished with a Bibliographical appendix, which gives us an idea of the general literature of the subject; also an index of Scripture citations, by which the reader can readily turn to any text that has been under discussion, also a copious general index. If such works could have a careful reading by those that most need instruction, they would accomplish immense good. The calamity is that those that most need help are the last to seek it where it is to be found.

The friends of the Bible, however, must do all they can to save such.

BOSTON MONDAY LECTURES, by Joseph Cook. 3 vols. Conscience, Heredity, and Marriage. Boston: Houghton, Osgood & Co. \$1.50 per vol.

The Boston Monday Lectures, by Mr. Cook, were begun in the Meionaon, in September, 1875, under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Boston. The popularity of these lectures increased so rapidly during the first winter, that, to secure their continuance, the Boston Monday Lectureship was founded in May, 1876, and placed for the next winter, under the care of a committee of scholars of different evangelical denominations. Thus, the Lectureship has become a permanent institution, being managed, each season, by a committee of Christian scholars.

Conscience, Heredity and Marriage, constitute the fourth, fifth, and sixth volumes of these lectures. They are all good, and we have read them with much pleasure.

CONSCIENCE.—Mr. Cook has certainly studied the subject of Conscience. His definitions are clear, his analysis critical, and his distinctions closely drawn.

He shows the Christian, the scholar, the theologian, and the thinker. We like his definition of conscience, and his distinction between what it includes and what it implies, is clearly and forcibly made.

On the infallibility of conscience, while he is metaphysical,

he is clear, orthodox, and simply unanswerable. He does not confound conscience with Paul's ignorance in persecuting the Church, as some others have done, by making it the mere creature of education.

The ten lectures of this volume must not only be read, but studied, to be fully appreciated.

HEREDITY.—These lectures are full of solid thought and scientific research. He defends Christian truth against modern scientific and philosophic heresies with a master's skill. He gives Maudsley, Spencer, Darwin, and others, some deep thrusts on their materialistic theories of evolution, and he does it with a sharp and very pointed blade. Infidelity has met its match in scientific reasoning in the person of Mr. Cook.

While these lectures are eminently scientific, systematic, logical, and profound, they are brilliant, attractive, and remarkably eloquent, and no one can read them carefully without being benefited.

Being pressed for time, we thought to give Heredity only a *glance over*, but after beginning, *at the beginning*, we were led on, page after page, by the irresistible force of logic and eloquence, until we read almost every word of each lecture.

MARRIAGE.—This volume ought to be read by everybody, but more especially by parents. This subject lies at the very foundation of all good society, and Mr. Cook should be voted a benefactor for presenting it as he has in these ten lectures. He has investigated the subject in search of truth, and has presented it in a forcible manner, according to the Bible and nature. It is orthodox to the core, and as fascinating as a *fairy tale*. One is instructed and greatly delighted in its perusal.

We advise all parents to buy the book and read it for the benefit of *the family*. Mr. Cook seems to have read much, retained all, and has an acute discrimination in separating truth from error.

His books have an immense sale, and he is accomplishing a good work for religion and true philosophy.

EVENINGS WITH THE DOCTRINES, by Nehemiah Adams, D.D., author of "Friends of Christ," "Christ a Friend," "Communion Sabbath," etc. Revised Edition. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co., Franklin street, corner of Hawley.

This is a small volume of four hundred and forty-seven pages, well printed in good clear type, and on good paper; neatly bound in cloth. The book comprises substantially a series of seventeen lectures delivered in Essex Street Church, Boston, in the winter of 1858-9. The work is written in easy and familiar style, very well suited to a promiscuous audience of church members. The design evidently was the more thorough indoctrination of the congregation in what Dr. Adams deemed the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. The subjects discussed are God, Divine Revelation, the Trinity, Deity of Christ, Deity of the Holy Spirit, Man, Atonement, Election, Regeneration, Perseverance, Christian Perfection, The Intermediate State, Retribution.

The work is orthodox according to the theological school to which the author belongs. As the subjects discussed clearly indicate, the book is intended as a sort of summary of doctrine. One lecture only is given to the being and attributes of God. This is characterized by many just and valuable thoughts. The subject of Divine Revelation is well treated. The author defends, with considerable ability, the doctrine of verbal or plenary inspiration. He says on page fifty: "As to the subject of verbal inspiration, we do not claim that each word is spoken or written mechanically by the Holy Spirit, acting on the faculties of inspired men." This is an unworthy view of the subject. If the Holy Spirit only superintended the use of words by the sacred writers, this would insure infallibility; and that is all which (that) would be necessary to plenary inspiration. But it cannot be explained why the language of Scripture, if there were no supernatural influence extending into it, should uniformly have the indescribable peculiarity which characterizes it—a peculiarity which cannot be fully accounted for by our sacred associations with holy writ.

Besides we think in words. If inspiration must be communicated to sacred writings, it is unphilosophical to say that

the thoughts were suggested, guided, superintended, but that no regard was had to words, each writer being left to express his inspired thoughts as he pleased. Right words in the right places are essential to the object of a communication. If, therefore, God proposes to make a communication to man, he must have perfect control, not only of the thoughts, but also of the words in which it is to be conveyed." This is good, scriptural doctrine. The organs of revelation were absolutely passive instruments in the hands of God. They did not speak when they pleased, nor what they pleased, nor as they pleased—"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—2 Peter i. 21.

We insist upon a literal interpretation of this text. Holy men, the organs of revelation, were moved *not to think, but to speak*. All scripture (all the sacred writing) is given by the inspiration of God.—2 Tim. iii. 16. Now all writing, secular or sacred, consists in the use of words. In revelation the words were given rather than the ideas, and the passive organ might or might not understand the import of the words. This is clearly shown by the declaration of Caiaphas, that "it was expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation."—John xi. 50, 51. Various dangerous heresies are put forth touching this important subject, each of which is supported by influential names. "Dr. Schleirmacher, Dr. DeWette, and many other German divines," says Dr. Gaussen, "reject all miraculous inspiration, and are unwilling to attribute to the sacred writers any more than Cicero accorded to the poets—*afflatum spiritus*—'a divine action of nature, an interior power resembling the other vital forces of nature.'"

Dr. Michaelis and others admit the existence of a divine inspiration, but confine it to a part only of the Scriptures.

M. Twiston and others allow something of an inspiration to all parts of the sacred books, but not to all in the same degree. Inspiration, according to this theory, may be universal but in unequal measure, and hence often imperfect.

Other theorists allow four different degrees of inspiration—the inspiration of superintendence, which preserves from serious error in all things pertaining to faith and practice; the inspiration of *elevation*, which lifts the thoughts of the men of God up into the purest regions of religious truth, and in some way stamps the character of holiness upon their words; the inspiration of direction which puts the organs of revelation under divine guidance, both as to what should be said, and what should not be said; inspiration of suggestion, which attributes all the thoughts and all the words to the direct and efficient operations of the Holy Spirit.—*Gaussen, Theopneustia*, pp. 26, 27, 28.

According to this scheme, *superintendence* expresses the lowest degree of inspiration, and *suggestion* the highest.

Dr. Adams, however, uses the word *superintendence* to express the fullest sense of theopneusty. This is evident from the fact that he asserts, in explanation of his position, the doctrine of verbal inspiration.

Gaussen not inappropriately characterizes all these distinctions concerning inspiration as “fantastic,” and says “the Bible has not authorized them; the Church of the first eight centuries of the Christian era knew nothing of them; and we believe them to be erroneous in themselves, and deplorable in their results.”

The Bible certainly authorizes no such distinctions. All scripture is given by inspiration; not a part; not some more and some less, but all alike full; hence the Scriptures are all alike true, and all alike authoritative. To abandon this position is to surrender the Scriptures as an infallible rule of faith and practice, and consequently to perplex the Church with endless discussion and endless doubt as to what is the mind of the Spirit, as to what is from God and what from men, as to what is truth and what is error. Dr. Adams' lecture on Divine Inspiration, especially in so far as it bears on the subject of verbal inspiration, is a valuable contribution to a department of religious instruction which has not received an adequate share of attention from the friends of the Bible and an unadulterated Christianity.

Our author's lectures on the Trinity and Divinity of

Christ, and on the Divinity of the Spirit, could not fail to be pertinent to a Boston audience, though its members might claim to be the very impersonation of approved orthodoxy. Where heterodoxy abounds, where the moral atmosphere is fetid with the exhalations of the innumerable and non-descript *isms* put forth by all sorts of dreamers, and schemers, and charlatans, it behooves orthodoxy, and a true religious conservatism, to be wide awake and on the alert.

The divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit are fundamental doctrines in the Bible scheme of salvation, and hence need to be kept prominently before the Church and the world.

Our author, in his lecture on Man, discusses in a "timorously prudent" manner, the doctrine of the fall, and the introduction of moral evil into the world. He asserts with sufficient boldness the transmission of Adam's defection to his posterity. He discourages, and even deprecates, what he deems a too free speculation in relation to the methods of the Divine administration, as things in themselves too deep and too high for human comprehension; and suggests that proper attention be given to the apostolic question, "Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"

We fully concur with our author, as to the unwisdom of a lawless speculation concerning things that manifestly lie beyond the range of our limited faculties. We should never, for a moment, indulge the dream that human ability is the limit of possibility. We should never discard any doctrine in physical science or theology, because we cannot understand it.

But while we thank our author for his very judicious suggestions in this regard, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that he and the theological school with which he is affiliated, allow to themselves well nigh unlimited latitude in their philosophical and theological speculations, carrying their speculations, aye, and their postulations too, up into the domain of the unrevealed and secret counsels of the incomprehensible God. What, for instance, is the doctrine of universal foreordination, but a bold speculation? What the doc-

trine of unconditional election and reprobation, but a bold speculation? What the attribution to God of *two wills*, one secret, decretive, and irresistible, creating the necessity of all things; the other revealed, and often in conflict with the secret and decretive, but powerless; the former choosing "*sin as a means to an end*"; the latter condemning sin—all sin as sin, or for its own sake? What, we ask, is this but daring speculation? If God ever had a secret will contrary to his revealed will, how come these friends to know it? Did their speculations reveal what God intended to be secret? But we forbear, and dismiss the ungracious subject with the modest hint, that whenever our Calvinistic friends are seized with a penchant for lecturing the world on the unwisdom of theological speculation, it might be discreet to defer to the adage, "Physician, heal thyself."

In the transmission of Adam's defected nature to his posterity, there is, when abstractly considered, the semblance of an injustice done to that posterity. Our author meets the objection raised on the score of this apparent injustice, in the only way in which it can be met; that is, by coupling representation in Christ, the second Adam, with representation in the first Adam; or, by considering the fall in the first Adam, and provisional redemption in the second Adam, the complements of each other. Had there been no representation in Adam, there would have been none in Christ. So it seems the angels stood each for himself—no representative before the fall, and none after their defection. Had there been no representation in Christ, there would have been none in Adam; *i. e.*, Adam would have had no posterity at all to be defected by his fall, or to suffer on his account.

On the hypothesis of this double representation—the one complementary of the other—the justice and the glory of the Divine administration is fully vindicated. No injustice is done to Adam's race, because what was lost by his disobedience is vastly more than compensated in the obedience and mediatorial word of the second Adam. Sin is the cause of no good to any one. It is alike hateful to God and hurtful to men. But the sin of our legal representative was made, through the infinite compassion of God, the occasion

of the introduction of a gracious economy—a gospel probation—under which we hesitate not to believe vastly more souls will be saved than would have been, had just such a probation been given to all as was given to Adam. But while we endorse Dr. Adam's answer to the impeachment of the Divine administration, in regard to this point, it occurs to us that the answer is valid and satisfactory only when the whole subject is viewed from an anti-Calvinistic standpoint; and that Dr. Adams is fighting infidelity with weapons that do not belong to the Calvinistic armory. Note the facts pertinent to the case:

1. God foreordained whatsoever comes to pass—all entities and events, all perceptions, emotions, volitions, and external acts.

This of necessity includes Adam, with all things pertaining to him, both intrinsically and extrinsically; also the transmission of his defection to his posterity, and all things pertaining to them, with every thought, every emotion, every volition, every act of every member of the human race, was pre-decreed—decreed from eternity.

2. God, for the illustration of his mercy, and from eternity, elected, unconditionally, a part of his race to salvation; and for the illustration of his justice, reprobated the other part to perdition.

3. In the fulness of time Christ died for the elect part of the human race; and though his death is infinitely meritorious, and therefore sufficient for all, yet it is divinely restricted to the elect, and designedly excludes the reprobate. Such is the theory, and such is the explicit teaching of our author in regard to the atonement.

In the light of these facts, it is so plain that the most stupid cannot fail to see it, that if representation in Adam, without corresponding representation in Christ, would be, as our author's argument assumes, an injustice to Adam's posterity, then an injustice is done to the non-elect, who have representation in Adam, and are consequently defected by his sin, but have no corresponding representation in Christ, and consequently receive no benefits from his death; or, which is the same thing, the reprobate receives in the death

and mediation of Christ no compensation for what they lose by their federal relation to Adam.

Dr. Adams' argument, therefore, is true only in relation to the elect, but is not true in relation to the reprobate. A vindication of the Divine administration in relation to one part, is no vindication of it in relation to another part. If an official does an injustice to ten men, and then even more than compensates five of them for the injury, there is no compensation to the other five. Such a procedure would be accounted by all discriminating and fair minded men, whimsical rather than just and honorable.

So long as our author affirms that *all* men are represented in Adam, and are defected by his sin, and that only a part have representation in Christ, his argument is as worthless as a vindication of the Divine administration. But if he will step down from his high limitarian ground, and make representation in the second Adam coextensive with representation in the first Adam, then his argument will be a full and satisfactory vindication of the Divine government.

Our author's twelfth lecture is on *election*. We have space for only a brief notice. He takes high Calvinistic ground; quotes the texts usually adduced in support of his theory, but, like his predecessors generally, he attempts no exegesis; no searching, sifting analysis of these texts, but quietly and self-complacently assumes that they contain the proof of his doctrine, leaving his reader to find, if he can, in what nook or fold it lies concealed, and to evolve it for himself.

He knew, of course, that every text he quotes is contested, and, in fact, we hesitate not to say that some of them, when fairly expounded, furnish conclusive proof against his theory.

A large part of the lecture is made up of cautions against what he deems over-inquisitiveness, explanations and apologies. He says, in a quite amiable way, many things that are *wholly* true, and in a very plausible way, many things that are *partially* true, and in a subtle way, some things that we think quite untrue.

Note the following:

He says: "It is not true that the elect will be saved, do

whatsoever they may." Granted: but they can do nothing that will endanger their salvation, else their election is a myth.

According to the theory, the means are as really decreed as the end; and the elect can just as easily break the decree of Omnipotence as he can refuse the means of his salvation.

Election, he says, leaves "those who are not saved in no worse a condition than though none were saved." Granted: but the vital question is, whether our Divine Father has, by a remorseless decree, put any in such a condition that their salvation is impossible, and if so why?

He says: "There can be no objection to 'election,' unless it interferes with the freedom of the individual or does injustice to others." To the first part of this proposition we reply, Certainly nobody objects to election, unless it interferes with the freedom of the individual. It is not to the election that men object, but to Calvinistic freedom, or the freedom of necessity, which finds its type in the egg or the acorn. According to Calvinistic freedom, the elect can no more keep out of heaven or the reprobate out of hell, than the egg can hatch out an oak or the acorn develop into an eagle. Yet both the elect and the reprobate move on freely to their respective destinies. The *will* is the foreordained subjective instrument—only instrument—by which man, every man, is urged to his predestined doom, while Omnipotence is the power behind the throne that shapes all destinies. Such is the freedom of Westminster theology and of all necessitarian philosophy.

In regard to the second part of the proposition, "Or does injustice to others," we cordially agree with our author, that election does no injustice to any one. We object not to election, but to its terrible counterpart—the unconditional and remorseless reprobation.

Our author lays down five propositions, which we will briefly notice.

1. "All men, if left to themselves, will continue to sin, and therefore will perish." True: but no man is left to himself, for, according to the theory, all the thoughts, emotions, volitions, and acts, and destiny of every man is foreordained.

2. God has resolved that he will rescue a part of mankind from perdition, by persuading and enabling them to do their duty. If this proposition is true, the converse is also true. Thus God has resolved to destroy in perdition a part of mankind, by entailing upon them the curse of a corrupt nature, and thereby disabling them from their duty (that is, if it is a duty for a man to do what God has decreed he shall not do).

3. "His (God's) influence on those who are saved is in perfect consistency with their freedom." Certainly. The same is true of those who are lost. The human will is as truly the instrument by which the ends of the Divine decrees are reached in the case of the reprobates as in the case of the elect. According to the theory, the human will is as veritably the servitor of the Divine purpose in one case as in the other.

4. "No injustice is done to those who are left; salvation is consistently offered to them, and their state is no worse than though all like them had perished." The first and the third number of this proposition have previously been noticed. The second we think is *not true*.

(a) Is it consistent for God himself to offer salvation, or to authorize others to offer it to those whom he has eternally reprobated to death?

(b) Is it consistent to offer salvation to those for whom none was ever intended, and none provided, and whose salvation is as impossible as the salvation of Satan himself? The answers readily suggest themselves to the discriminating reader.

5. "God proposed from all eternity to do that which he has actually done and is to do." This is exactly true, but is, permit us to suggest, a very different thing from proposing, from all eternity, to save, unconditionally, a part of the human race, and to damn unconditionally the other part.

OLD FAITHS IN NEW LIGHT, by Newman Smyth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 391.

This work is apologetical in its character, being a defense of the Old Faiths—the Bible and the Christianity which it

reveals. It is one of the most charming books on the subject we have read in many a day. It glows from beginning to end. The style is unimpeachable and the thought is profound. It is not altogether an original book, of course, but it is the work of a master who is acquainted with the literature of both sides of his subject, and knows how to handle it. We do not pretend to say that we endorse every sentence of the book, but we do wish that every intelligent layman and minister of our Church could read it carefully. It would be old faiths in a new light; and still the integrity and sacredness of the old faiths would remain unscathed, and the grasp of love which they may have upon the reader's mind and heart would be not weakened but strengthened. There is a suspicion that the advanced scholarship and the old faiths are to-day at variance; but whether they are at variance or not, the mere suspicion is itself a fruitful cause of popular indifference and unbelief. It would be well to recognize the fact that "the Christian faith suffers more from a certain vague mistrust, or undefined unbelief, among the people, than it does from any one positive and definite form of infidelity. This indefinite mistrust, moreover, arises partly from knowledge and partly from ignorance. It emanates from the knowledge that there has been of late much destructive criticism of the old theologies, and from ignorance of the methods and the results of the best Christian scholarship. As a little warmth of the rising sun may call up the very mists which are to be dissipated by its more powerful shining, so this vague and chilling popular unbelief is to be dispelled, not by withholding knowledge, but by shedding abroad all possible light. The history of Christian doctrine shows that one work which is required every generation or two, of Christian thought, is to rearrange its faiths in new lights; and many signs indicate a present and growing need of some resetting of the so-called Christian evidences." No fact is better known than that every age of the Church requires its peculiar apologetics; and it is for such reasons as these that we would have a book like this extensively read. As for our own age, does it not come speaking new tongues which our fathers knew not of? We,

who have inherited our fathers' faiths as our birthright, will cling to the old faiths; but we must, whether we will or not, learn the strange tongues also, and, perhaps, after all, we shall find to our joy that we can still prophecy in them; "that some of the very words which at first we feared were without God, and without hope in the world, are the very best words the human reason has ever found in which to declare the ways of the Spirit." At any rate, it is God's truth that we want, let it speak in whatever tongue it may. "Truth," said Bishop Butler to a friend, "I intend to make the business of my life;" and it was that school-boy intention which was afterwards wrought out in his immortal "Analogy." "It is said that Jacobi, the faith-philosopher, as he was called, while still a student at the university, upon reading for the first time Kant's treatise on the proofs of the existence of a God, was seized with a violent palpitation of the heart, so intense was his interest in the renewed discussion of man's oldest and greatest faith." And no wonder, for are not these faiths, old as the race though they be, our supreme concern? And is it not our chief business here to think of them and to work them out in our lives? But there are those who are indifferent to both the beauty and the value of truth; to whom a surface thought, a passing glance at the visions of prophets and seers, is enough, pleased as they are with "the mere trappings and externals of the royal realm through which our souls are traveling, while they might linger in the palace itself and rejoice in beholding the wonderful treasures of the kingdom of Truth." But unfortunately this is not all, nor the worst. There is in science, and letters, and religion, as well as in politics, a pure, simple, wicked, and mischievous demagogism, which nobody ought to like, and which nobody ought to tolerate.

But the majority of people have a fine faculty of being gulled. Sometimes they even like to be gulled; and that is the reason—one reason at least—why popular infidelity has so many popular, but arrant, demagogues—"lecturers who carry on a notorious business of atheism on a small capital of philosophic or scientific thought, and usually borrowed capital besides. A man of fluent wit will go up and down

through the Bible or ecclesiastical history, very much as a political stump-speaker will look through the Congressional records, or our national history, for the points of his partisan speech. He will begin with Genesis and find mistakes of Moses in abundance. He will expatiate upon the absurdities of the story of the ark. He will pause in dramatic horror before the cruel wars of the Jews. He will single out an imprecatory psalm or two; and when he comes to the New Testament, he will find in it discrepancies and misstatements enough to prove that all the apostles were little better than literary thieves and robbers. Then he will run up and down through the Christian ages, beholding every rack and thumb-screw, but regardless of the many martyrs; putting his finger upon the dark stains, but not noticing the illuminated pages of ecclesiastical history; complaining of the gloom of scholastic theology, but blind to the growing light. He will have at his tongues' end second hand and unverified quotations from the Calvinists, and he will descant knowingly upon the "conflict of religion and science," though, like Dr. Draper in his book, it never occurs to him to spoil his book by giving an exact definition of either; and so on to the end of the chapter. This is demagogism—such as deceives many, but such as should deceive none. How should it be met? Not with similar prejudice and want of candor; and hence there should be no such thing as a theological demagogue. But is there not? Yes; unfortunately he is not altogether an antiquated character. He makes the Bible the book in which he seeks his dogmas, and in which he never fails to find them. "He passes through the Bible in the same blind, partisan way. He fits the Bible to his notion of what it should be." All biblical learning which does not support his traditional opinions is to him rationalistic and unsound. He never doubts. His knowledge is all definite, whether it lies within the sphere of experience or far out on the very borders of revelation. He is sincere, but too narrow; and is ready to read everybody out into the ranks of gross unbelief who ventures to differ from him. This spirit is all wrong too. It is hurtful to the very cause which it would defend. Not in such way are the threatening forms of unbelief to be laid.

A faith that would stand in these days must not lean upon its own prejudices. "There is only one state of mind which, in such investigations, is truly and profoundly reverent and religious, and that is, the desire to find the facts as they are." That is certainly true. And nobody need be afraid of the facts—whether found here or there—whether called by one name or another. God made them, and whosoever is afraid of them does not believe in God. Let the talking in strange tongues go on then. There is no permanent danger. Truth is the daughter of time, and not of authority. After a while, perhaps soon, we shall "emerge from the age of storm and bitterness into the season of calm and broader vision." "There is a classic story," says our author, "that a fire once ran over the Pyrenean mountains, destroying all the vineyards of the inhabitants. But as the villagers mourned for their vines, they discovered that the fire, which had destroyed their grapes, had opened by its heat fissures in the rocks, through which gleamed rich veins of silver. I believe that the terribly destructive criticism of our day is to leave us richer than it found us. It may burn up many of our traditions, but it will disclose to us deep and precious truths. Even the rationalistic critics of Germany, who have labored so hard to destroy the historical credibility of our gospels, have left us greatly indebted to their work for our understanding of the Bible and our religion."

We have quoted largely from the book, and thereby given the reader some idea of the author's style. We intended to say something especially about its structure and contents, but we have not the space. We hope "Old Faiths in New Light" may meet with a large sale.

WORDS: THEIR USE AND ABUSE, by William Mathews, LL.D., author of "Getting on in the World," etc. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1880.

This is a book which should be in every library. It is well written, and is at the same time useful, instructive, and entertaining. We could not better present a correct idea of the work, than by quoting a few passages from the several chapters.

While showing the absurdity of certain methods of defining words, the author says: "It is easy to define words as certain persons satirized by Pascal, have defined *light*—'A luminary movement of luminous bodies'; or as a Western judge once defined *murder* to a jury—'Murder, gentlemen, is when a man is murderously killed. It is *murdering* that constitutes murder in the eye of the law. Murder, in short, is—murder.' We have all smiled at Dr. Johnson's definition of *net-work*—'Net-work: anything reticulated or decussated at equal distances, with interstices between the intersections.' . . . The eccentric Davy Crockett, whose exterior roughness veiled a great deal of mother wit, happily characterized this whole tribe of lexicographers, by a remark he once made to a Western member of Congress. When the latter, in a speech on a bill increasing the number of hospitals, wearied his hearers by incessant repetition—'Sit down,' whispered Crockett, 'you are coming out of the same hole you went in at.'"

The chapter on "Morality of Words," is very fine. It is singular that the author could not forego the opportunity of showing his prejudice, and at the same time his ignorance. While condemning the frequent misuse of the word "gentleman," he says: "But in the United States the word has been so emptied of its original meaning, especially in some of the Southern States, where society has hardly emerged from a feudal state, and where men who shoot each other in a street-fray, still babble of being 'born gentlemen,' and of 'dying like gentlemen,'" etc. Again, in attempting to show how crime is softened by the misuse of words, he says: "And men have plotted without compunction the downfall of the government, and plundered its treasury as 'secessionists,' who would have expected to dangle at the rope's end, or to be shot down like dogs, had they regarded themselves as rebels or traitors." If our author had battled against the "rebels" in real strife, as energetically as he is now fighting the army of bad words, perhaps he would have spoken of that part of his fellow-citizens more respectfully. Will he allow us to suggest, that if we expect to influence others to be "gentlemen," we must ourselves set the example?

In speaking of the disposition of some people to use what they suppose to be "Grand Words," he thus cauterizes our brethren of the medical profession: "How few surgeons can communicate in simple, intelligible language, to a jury in a law case, the result of a *post-mortem* examination! Almost invariably the learned witness finds a wound 'in the parietes of the abdomen, opening the peritoneal cavity,' or an injury of some 'vertebra in the dorsal, or lumber region.'"

In discussing the power of "Small Words" the author says: "What a volume of meaning is condensed in the derisive 'Oh! Oh!' which greets a silly utterance in the House of Commons! . . . Again, what depth of meaning in this little word, as an expression of grief, in the following lines by Wordsworth:

'She lived unknown, and few could know
When Lucy ceased to be;
Now she is in her grave—and Oh!
The difference to me.'

. . . These little words, so expressive of joy, of hope, of doubt, of fear, which leap from the heart like fiery jets from volcanic isles—these surviving particles of the ante-Babel tongues, which spring with the flush or blanching of the face to all lips, and are understood by all men—are emphatically and preëminently language."

In the chapter on "Abuses of Words," he says: "All our orators rival Demosthenes in eloquence; they beat Chillingworth in logic, and their sarcasm is more withering than that of Junius himself. Who ever heard of a public meeting in this country, that was not an 'immense demonstration'? of an actor's benefit, at which the house was not 'crowded from pit to dome'? of a political nomination that was not 'sweeping the country like wild-fire'?"

In advising as to the most effective mode of speaking or writing, the author aptly says: "Never call on the 'tenth legion,' or the 'old guard,' except on occasions corresponding to the dignity and weight of those tremendous forces. Say plain things in a plain way, and then when you have occasion to send a sharp arrow at your enemy, you will not

find your quiver empty of shafts, which you wasted before you wanted."

We close this notice with a passage criticizing the improper use of the word *get*: "Hardly any other word in the language is so abused as the word *get*. A man says, 'I have got a cold'; he means simply, 'I have a cold.' Another says that a certain lady 'has got a fine head of hair,' which may be true if the hair is false, but is probably meant as a compliment. A third says, 'I have got to leave the city for New York this evening,' meaning only that he has to leave the city. . . . Even so able a writer as Prof. Whitney expresses himself thus, 'Whoever yet got through learning his mother tongue, and could say, "The work is done"?"'

A COMPLETE HEBREW AND CHALDEE LEXICON, by Benjamin Davies, Ph.D., LL.D., revised by Edward C. Mitchell, D. D. W. F. Draper, publisher, Andover, Mass.

There is not a more encouraging proof of the increasing interest felt in the study of the Hebrew Scriptures, than the somewhat rapid multiplication of Hebrew grammars and lexicons, both in this country and abroad. It is certainly gratifying to every intelligent lover of the old oracles of God, that a knowledge of this department of Old Testament interpretation is coming to be more and more appreciated. We see no good reason, indeed, why the Hebrew, the oldest of the languages, might not take its place at the beginning of a course of college study, rather than to be relegated exclusively to the theological student and the seminary. It seems to us that the intelligent layman might as well be able to read the Hebrew Bible as the *Iliad* or the *Æneid*. In its main features, the Hebrew is simpler than the Greek or the Latin; and, its vocabulary being limited, is more easily mastered than either. Is it not to be hoped that the day is not distant when the college curriculum will be so modified as to allow both time and place for the study of Hebrew? As a contribution towards so desirable an end, we welcome the Lexicon before us. Every addition to the list makes helps of this kind more accessible to the student. Fortunately for those who may wish to obtain some knowl-

edge of the language without the aid of a teacher, the work is prefaced with the Shemitic alphabets and introductory notes on the elements of the Hebrew Grammar, and is supplemented with an extensive English-Hebrew index, which the beginner, especially, will find quite valuable. It is based, of course, on the Lexicons of Fürst and Gesenius, but contains about a thousand more words and forms than the latter, and costs about half as much money as the former. The definitions are not discussed, but stated sufficiently at length, references being given to the passages in which the words occur.

We are glad to say to those whose vision may be defective, that the type is charming to the eye. If any of our ministers or laymen want a cheap and handy Hebrew Lexicon, and yet one that will answer all their purposes, we have no hesitancy in recommending this one.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN HUSS; OR, THE BOHEMIAN REFORMATION OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY, by E. H. Gillet, D.D. Third Edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1870.

This work has been too long before the public, and is probably too well-known, to require more than a brief mention by us. Owing to its peculiarly interesting character, however, embracing, as it does, the personal history and experience of the great Bohemian Reformer, as well as a narrative, of the most important ecclesiastical and political transactions of the times, both during his life and for a long period after his day, we cannot commend it too highly to all the lovers of the Church and her history. To understand fully the origin, growth, and spirit of the general reformation of the sixteenth century, it is necessary to have a just idea of the character, extent, and influence of the evangelical reform begun by Huss, at Brazen, more than half a century before. For this purpose, the work before us offers the most valuable assistance. Here we can find related in detail what, in more general historical works, would be merely referred to, or in many cases, entirely omitted. To the student of history, who would enter particularly into the

transactions of those times, it is indispensable. As a work of reference, it is well suited, by its convenience of form and arrangement, to the wants of those who have little time for extensive reading. To the more general reader, its perusal would be both interesting and profitable.

The work is printed in two neat octavo volumes of from six to eight hundred pages. The table of contents is arranged under general heads in chronological order. Aided by this, and the general index, with easy reference to the appendix for additional explanations, the investigator can readily find the facts relative to any person or event mentioned in the text. The foot-notes cite the numerous authorities from which the materials for the narrative have been drawn, thus furnishing the means of testing the accuracy of the writer. The present edition has been greatly improved and enlarged by additions in the form of notes, and sometimes to the text. In the work of revision the author has been assisted by consulting authorities to which he could heretofore have no access. He has spared no pains in his "labor of love," to gather up and present to the public everything of interest in the life of the illustrious martyr, and we think his work a valuable contribution to the cause of literature.

INGERSOLL AND MOSES, by Samuel Ives Curtiss, D.D. Chicago: Janson, McClung & Co.

Ingersoll can very well afford to have his name associated with that of Moses, if Moses does not object to having his name associated with that of Ingersoll. One of the best ways to celebrate some less noble names is to link them to the great and immortal. Ingersoll and Moses! The fact that Ingersoll's name stands first implies, in this case, that Ingersoll has attacked Moses. But who is Ingersoll? He is as the dew of the morning, which quickly vanishes; as a pebble thrown into the sea, which produces only a ripple—the very smallest ripple. He is one who does not say new things about Moses, but old things, like the above similes, which have been used some millions of times. And who was Moses, or rather who *is* Moses? for he still endures,

notwithstanding the dew reappears continually, and the pebble has from time immemorial made its daily ripple in the sea. Moses is like Gibraltar, against whose base a thousand accumulated waves may beat for thousands of years, and yet Gibraltar remain unmoved. And so it will be evermore. We are sorry for Ingersoll. His task is so hopeless. And there is also something ludicrous about it; for the pebble that falls at Gibraltar's side, producing its infinitesimal wavelet in the sea, is so small compared with the great granite pillar itself. If we were in his place, we would give up in despair and have never a word more to say about the "mistakes of Moses."

Still, it was worth while for Dr. Curtiss to write the little book which lies before us. Col. Ingersoll's influence is unfortunately insidious and widespread, for there are many hearts which at best seem to grow faint even at the scarcely heard murmuring of the wavelet. Those who have *honest* doubts as to any parts of the Mosaic writings, cannot fail to be greatly profited by what Dr. Curtiss has to say in reply to Colonel Ingersoll's old objections. Nor does it make any difference whether such doubters live in the Northwest or elsewhere.

We have nothing to say, of course, about the political opinions peculiar to any party, but we should like to suggest that the young men of the Northwest, to whom this readable book is dedicated, might contribute something toward paralyzing Ingersoll's influence for evil, by discountenancing the scurrilous political diatribes which the Colonel is wont to utter before Northwestern audiences.

LIGHTS ON THE WAY, or Helps for Young Christians, by Rev. J. R. Brown, D.D. Nashville, Tenn.: Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House. 1879. Cloth, \$1.

This is a well written and beautiful little book of one hundred and fifty-six pages. It is divided into six parts, headed respectively, *Finding the Way*, *Starting Out*, *In the Shadows*, *The Pleasures of Sin*, *The Doctrines*, *Life in the Hymns*. We take pleasure in recommending the book to all young Christians, and older ones will find pleasure and profit in its perusal.

The publishers and author deserve credit for the style in which this beautiful little volume is gotten up. It is a good book for a holiday present. This is the author's first book, but we hope it will not be his last.

RAMBLES AMONG THE INSECTS, by the Rev. Samuel Findley, D.D., Corresponding Member of the American Entomological Society. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 1334 Chestnut street. Pp. 279.

Here the meed of praise must be given both to the publishers and the author. Every man who writes a book to popularize science confers a benefit on the world. The author of this work has presented the leading wonders of the insect world in a very attractive manner, and we would be glad to see this book in every family in the land. The subject is presented in a series of colloquies between Uncle Samuel and his sister's four children together with their cousin from the city. An improvement might have been made by arranging the subject a little more scientifically, and presenting somewhere a complete conspectus of the families and genera of the insecta. While we popularize, we should still be scientific. Altogether, the book is well worthy of perusal.

MOTIVES OF LIFE, by David Swing. Third Edition. Chicago: Jansen, McClung & Co. 1879. Cloth, \$1.

This is a well written and very readable little book of one hundred and sixty-two pages. Its object seems to be to stimulate the young to high and noble attainments. The language is chaste and the sentiment healthy. While Prof. Swing is, perhaps, not a logical writer, he is vigorous, honest, and forcible.

The table of contents gives the six great motives which he discusses, to-wit: Intellectual Progress, Home, A Good Name, The Pursuit of Happiness, Benevolence, Religion.

[Other books have been received, which will be noticed in the April number.]



SCHOOLS.

Cumberland University.

This Institution is complete in all its departments. It has a thorough Preparatory School, with five instructors; a Collegiate Department, with four professors; a Theological School, with five professors and instructors.

EXPENSES:

Preparatory School.....	\$20.00
Freshman and Sophomore Classes, each.....	20.00
Junior and Senior Classes, each.....	25.00
Law School.....	50.00
Contingent fee.....	5.00
Boarding per week, in families.....	3.50
In clubs.....	\$1.25 to 2.00

Candidates for the ministry are received free of charge.

Students in the Theological School are charged a matriculation fee of \$5.00, in addition to the contingent fee.

For catalogues, or further information, address,

N. GREEN, Chancellor,
LEBANON, TENN.

Waynesburg College,

WAYNESBURG, PA.

BOTH SEXES ADMITTED.

A Live Institution,

UNSURPASSED IN

Healthfulness of Location,
Thoroughness of Instruction,
Economy of Expense,
and Moral Tone,
affording the most desirable facilities for acquiring a thorough

English and Classical Education,
At the Least Possible Expense.

Winter term begins January 7, 1880.
Spring term begins March 31, 1880.
Fall term begins September 8, 1880.

For fuller information address
A. B. MILLER, D.D., President.

Lincoln University,

LINCOLN, ILLINOIS.

This Institution is carrying into effect, under proper restrictions, the co-education of young ladies and gentlemen, and is believed to be equal to the best colleges and seminaries in the land.

Besides the regular Preparatory and Collegiate Departments, it affords ample facilities for instruction in Painting, Penmanship, Modern Languages, and Elocution; and has connected with it a Conservatory of Music, in which all branches of this science are taught. Students completing the course prescribed in the Conservatory will receive diplomas.

GOOD BOARDING

can be obtained in private families from \$3.00 to \$3.50 per week, and in clubs from \$2.00 to \$2.25.

For catalogues, or any particulars, address,

A. J. McGLUMPHY, D.D., President,
63 LOGAN ST.

Trinity University.

Rev. W. E. BEEBON, D.D., President.

A Full Corps of First-Class Teachers.

Classical, Scientific, and Commercial Courses.

MUSIC AND MODERN LANGUAGES
BY THE BEST TEACHERS.

THE INSTITUTION IS FOR BOTH
MALE AND FEMALE.

CHARGES MODERATE.

TEHUACANA is one of the healthiest locations in Texas.

For particulars address the President,

TEHUACANA,
LIMESTONE CO., TEXAS.

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY.

FACULTY:—

N. GREEN, LL.D., Chancellor.

R. BEARD, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology.

S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature.

R. V. FOSTER, Professor of Hebrew and New Testament Greek.

LECTURES delivered during the Winter months: On Pastoral Work, by A. J. Baird, D.D.; on Mission Work, by J. R. Brown, D.D.

MINISTERS and others who feel an interest in the circulation of the QUARTERLY, are earnestly solicited to act as agents.

No subscription will be taken for a less time than one year, and the back numbers of the volume will, in all cases, be sent whenever it is practicable to do so. Price per single copy, *in advance*, Two Dollars per annum. An extra copy to any one sending a club of three.

Subscribers changing their post-office address are requested to give notice to the Publisher.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for all the views of their correspondents. No writer, however, will be permitted to express sentiments subversive of any of the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures. Free discussion will be tolerated in the pages of the QUARTERLY, provided a dignified and Christian spirit is maintained.

Money should be sent by Check, Post-office Order, Draft, or Express. Otherwise the remittance will be at the sender's risk.

All matter for publication, and all matters of business connected with the QUARTERLY, should be sent to the publisher,

REV. J. D. KIRKPATRICK,
LEBANON, TENN.